



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023

No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAREY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 1, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE CAREY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RECOGNIZING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on the first day of February, to recognize Career and Technical Education Month.

During this month, we highlight the impact of CTE programs, programs that can be referred to as learn-to-earn. These programs are for learners at all levels. We recognize the role of

CTE in supporting industry seeking to fill positions in high-demand, high-skill, and high-wage jobs and career fields.

My appreciation for CTE came at a very early age. My father, coming out of the Navy, went through a CTE program, which led him to a job as a tool and die maker. Eventually, he decided to start his own business, which became quite successful.

As co-chair of the bipartisan House Career and Technical Education Caucus and a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I have always supported and will continue to support CTE programs that provide learners of all ages with career-ready skills.

From agriculture to the arts, from marketing to manufacturing, CTE programs work to develop America's most valuable resource: its people.

A one-size-fits-all approach to education is not an effective way to prepare students for the workforce. We are doing students a great disservice when we only promote what is considered a traditional college experience.

CTE has established itself as a path that many high-achieving students choose in pursuit of industry certification and hands-on skills that they can use right out of high school, in skill-based education programs, or in college.

Mr. Speaker, CTE Month recognizes the benefits of a skills-based education and the valuable contributions CTE students make to the American workforce.

Congress recognized the importance of CTE when we passed the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which helps to close the skills gap by modernizing the Federal investment in CTE programs and connecting educators with industry stakeholders. This bill was later signed into law by President Trump in 2018.

While this is a major milestone, there is still much more work to be done. That is why I will continue to put forward commonsense pieces of legislation that update and promote workforce development throughout our Nation.

These include: The Counseling for Career Choice Act, which ensures that high school students are made fully aware of their career and educational options prior to graduation, including non-degree certificate programs, internships, apprenticeships, and 2-year and 4-year degree programs.

There is also the Skills Investment Act, which enhances tax advantaged savings accounts for educational expenses so American workers can use the accounts to pay for skills-based learning, career training, and workforce development.

Lastly, the Cybersecurity Skills Integration Act, creates a \$10 million pilot program within the Department of Education to award competitive grants to education-employer partnerships for the development, implementation, and/or expansion of postsecondary CTE programs that integrate cybersecurity education into curricula preparing students for careers in critical infrastructure sectors.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my fellow colleagues to join my co-chair, Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon, and me on the bipartisan House Career and Technical Education Caucus as we work to restore the rungs on the ladder of opportunity for all.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the first day of Black History Month and to honor the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H581

Greensboro Four for exemplifying this year's Black History Month theme: Black Resistance.

Black history is American history, but it is important to remember that this isn't ancient history. The Greensboro Four, also known as the A&T Four, sparked the sit-in movement in 1960, just 63 years ago today.

Think about that. Only six decades ago, during my lifetime, Black Americans in the South were forced to use different water fountains, eat at separate lunch counters, go to different bathrooms, and, most of all, suffer the indignity of second-class citizenship.

That is why on February 1, 1960, four courageous Black students from North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, my alma mater, Ezell Blair, Jr., David Richmond, Franklin McCain, and Joseph McNeil, sat down at a Whites-only lunch counter and asked to be served. In doing so, the Greensboro Four changed the United States forever.

The sit-in movement spread to cities across the South where Black resistance against segregation, discrimination, and Jim Crow eventually led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which outlawed segregation in public accommodations.

It is with great pride today that I recognize the A&T Four and every American who joined the sit-in movement to protest the racism of the Jim Crow South and eventually changed public policy.

These protests against injustice led to civil rights and voting rights for Black Americans, as well as equal protection under the law.

Whether it was at that Woolworth's counter or on a bus in Montgomery or in a jail cell in Birmingham or a bridge in Selma, Alabama, or on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial or a Baptist Church in Atlanta or in a St. Louis, Missouri, courthouse before the Civil War or at a slave rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia, in the antebellum South, Black resistance has nourished and slowly but surely worked to perfect American democracy.

We, as a Nation, have a responsibility to learn from our past and work diligently to carry on the legacy of these four men and all of our ancestors in the movement by ensuring equal rights for all of the people and protecting the civil rights we all fought so hard to win.

Black history is more important than ever. If it wasn't so important, they wouldn't try to stop us from teaching it. Last month, Florida schools announced they would not teach an advanced placement course in African-American history. The State of Florida's letter to the college board claimed the course "lacks educational value." I disagree.

We can't afford to remove critical thinking from our curriculum. Our students won't understand American history without understanding African-American history.

Those who don't understand history, Mr. Speaker, are doomed to repeat it. That is why this February, all Americans must recommit to teaching Black history in our homes, our schools, our churches, on TV, on Twitter, and, yes, even in the Halls of Congress.

We must be unified and unafraid to say "Black" and to teach our history and heritage. Because if we don't remember the Greensboro Four, Rosa Parks, Martin Luther and Coretta Scott King, John Lewis, Hattie McDaniel, Frederick Douglass, Harriet and Dred Scott, Nat Turner, Harriet Tubman, and countless others, someday, somewhere, someone will have to endure what they endured to win, yet again, the rights and the respect they fought for. That is why for me, every month, Mr. Speaker, is Black History Month.

REMEMBERING DEVIN WILLOCK AND CHANDLER LeCROY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tragic passing of Devin Willock and Chandler LeCroy of the University of Georgia. Following the Georgia football national championship parade, Devin and Chandler were in a tragic accident that claimed their lives.

Devin played offensive line for the Bulldogs and was a key part of their national championship run this past season. Devin will be remembered by all as a kind soul that loved his family, the game of football, and his teammates.

Chandler graduated from the University of Georgia in 2020 with a master's degree and then went on to work as a recruiting analyst for the Bulldogs. Members of the Georgia football staff spoke about her passion for Georgia athletics and how she always went above and beyond in her work. Her warm spirit and love for her beloved Bulldogs will be remembered by all.

I know that I speak for the entire First District, for the State of Georgia, and for the Bulldog Nation when I say that we will miss Devin and Chandler, but I know that their legacy will live on.

RECOGNIZING HINESVILLE, GEORGIA

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hinesville, Georgia, for being a great place to live, work, and raise a family.

Recently, Hinesville was erroneously named as one of the most miserable places to live in all of the State of Georgia. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, Hinesville is not only one of the best cities in the First District of Georgia, but it is arguably one of the best cities in all of the State.

Hinesville is one of the fastest growing cities in all of southeast Georgia. It is home to Fort Stewart and the 3rd Infantry Division, the largest Army installation east of the Mississippi River.

Across the city, Spanish moss gracefully drapes from the magnificent oak trees. There is a farmers market every Thursday and countless festivals throughout the year.

Hinesville is a wonderful community, full of southern hospitality and a relaxed way of life. The only thing miserable about this city are the attitudes of people who won't give it a fair shake. I am proud of Hinesville. It is a great city.

HONORING COACH PAUL JOHNSON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legendary college football coach Paul Johnson for his induction into the College Football Hall of Fame.

Utilizing his patented spread offense, Johnson compiled a career record of 189-99 in 22 seasons. In 11 seasons at Georgia Tech, he had a record of 82-60. His 82 wins are fourth-most in Tech history.

Johnson is responsible for two 10-win seasons and one 11-win season at Tech. He led the Jackets to nine bowl appearances and three Atlantic Coast Conference Championship games. Johnson received ACC Coach of the Year honors three times in his career and National Coach of the Year honors twice.

When he stepped down at Tech at the end of the 2018 season, his 189 career victories ranked fourth among NCAA Division I FBS head coaches.

While I may be a Georgia Bulldog, I want to congratulate Coach Johnson for his legendary career and his induction into the College Football Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING OLYMPIA CAFE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Olympia Cafe located in Savannah, Georgia.

The Olympia Cafe has been ranked in the top 10 percent of restaurants worldwide by a popular online travel company. Owner Nick Pappas started the restaurant in Savannah over 30 years ago. Before opening in the city, he had been told numerous times that Savannah was not the best place to open a cafe. However, those people were wrong. Pappas has found the perfect location.

Olympia Cafe regularly hosts famous movie celebrities and worldwide travelers. He is proud of the restaurant's award because it relies on customer reviews, which reflects the cafe's hard work.

I would like to congratulate Pappas and everyone at the Olympia Cafe for winning this wonderful award.

□ 1015

CENTRAL HUDSON OVERCHARGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring voice to my constituents who have been screwed over and ripped off by our utility company, Central Hudson.

My colleagues here may never have heard of Central Hudson, but the people of the Hudson Valley know them all too well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the farmer in Ulster Park, New York, who received such a massive utility bill, \$16,585, 17 times her normal bill, that she actually contemplated suicide. She described the debt, which put her at risk of losing her family farm, as a guillotine hanging over her head.

I rise for the single mother in Kingston who told me she is afraid to cook for her four kids because turning on the stove means facing a gigantic gas bill.

For the mayor of our city of Newburgh, who received a bill of \$708,000 for a single month of electricity at his three-bedroom family home; for senior citizens on a fixed income who had their entire checking accounts wiped out by an autopay withdrawal.

I could tell hundreds more of these stories and still not scratch the surface of this incredible corporate ineptitude.

Mr. Speaker, we rely on our public utilities for a necessary service. They exist for the public good. They are built on a foundation of public trust.

Central Hudson, and its CEO, Mr. Charles Freni, have irrevocably broken this trust. Since my calls for an investigation into Central Hudson's disastrous billing practices almost a year ago, we have received more than 11,000 formal complaints. A New York State Department of Public Service report revealed Central Hudson's billing system was riddled with hundreds of programming errors, leading to nearly 5,000 customers not receiving their bills, 8,000 customers overcharged, and more than 30,000 customers whose autopay was billed incorrectly, costing them over \$16 million.

I want to be clear. I do not fault the hardworking employees of Central Hudson. They begged for additional training. They suggested improvements to this system. They worked hours and hours of overtime. They wanted to do the right thing for the people of the Hudson Valley, but Central Hudson and its CEO clearly did not.

Just 2 weeks ago in response to this devastating Public Service Commission report documenting their systemic failures, Central Hudson doubled-down on their deflection, their denial, and their deception. Rather than taking ownership of their failures, they claimed that no customers were overcharged and that nobody lost any money.

Give me a break.

Central Hudson's leadership deliberately chose to sweep these problems under the rug. Why?

Because now owned by a multibillion-dollar and multinational corporation, they chose to put profits over people. At the same time as customers'—my constituents'—bills were skyrocketing and bank accounts were literally being emptied out, their reve-

nues were up over 30 percent and their profits—surprise, surprise—they are up, too.

Central Hudson has had opportunity after opportunity to own their mistakes and take accountability, but time and again they have failed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply no excuse for this. At a time when our families are facing tremendous economic pressure, the last thing they need to worry about is their bank accounts being emptied out just because they tried to power their home.

Because of these failures and because of Central Hudson's continued unwillingness to take accountability, today I am calling on Central Hudson's CEO, Mr. Charles Freni, to do the right thing for our community and to resign.

We need a new leader who will come in, improve service, finally fix these systemic problems, and start the critical work to rebuild trust with our community. That is what the people of the Hudson Valley deserve.

DOCTORS KNOW BEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the Freedom for Healthcare Workers Act that has been submitted and we will soon vote on.

As an ER physician who has treated thousands of patients, who has been exposed to COVID thousands of times, and watched nurses and midlevels and healthcare workers of all kinds complain about the government's involvement in healthcare, I wanted to address this topic.

I believe I am the only Congressman who has actually been an ER doctor in the pandemic. My last shift was December 28. I intubated a patient and saw three critical patients. Several of them had COVID. Nobody was admitted for COVID, though.

Back to the point, though. During this pandemic we started off with no vaccination. Meanwhile, most of us were exposed regardless of what PPE we had, and it was limited at times to people who had fevers, who had symptoms even before we knew what COVID was. A lot of us got sick and developed immunity naturally.

Then the government stepped in. Although well-meaning, a lot of times government officials think they have the answer to everything, including things they really don't know about. What they will do is cherry-pick the experts that agree with them to say this is what experts believe, and that is why all healthcare professionals should believe this also. That is not how we make progress in medicine. As a matter of fact, it stifles innovation and progress.

At one time we had a President, President Garfield, who was shot, and it was poor practice in medicine where

doctors probed his wound and made him septic that caused him to die. There was a dissenting opinion by Dr. Lister—you may have heard of Listerine—who believed in antiseptic but he was scoffed at and belittled because he was the outlying person. Imagine where we would be if government stepped in and said: Our experts said you don't need to wash your hands before you probe wounds. We would still be in the Dark Ages of medicine.

I beg the government to stay out of the way of healthcare progress. To stay out of the debate of healthcare professionals because, quite frankly, very few people in Congress understand medicine the way healthcare professionals do. They haven't been to medical school, and even those who have, they haven't been in medicine for a long time. Quite frankly, the Doctors Caucus is seldom relied on for healthcare policy, which is a shame.

If you haven't been to medical school, if you haven't taken your boards, if you haven't been through a residency, if you haven't seen tens of thousands of patients, you shouldn't be telling doctors who have a dissenting opinion what to do.

There is no standard of care based on government. It is based on physicians having a good decision, trying different things, and finding out what works. That is how medicine has progressed in America; far beyond any limitations that we have in foreign countries.

We are the leaders of innovation and healthcare. We should consider our healthcare professionals when we make decisions and not consider government first when it comes to standard of care.

If you want to require healthcare professionals to have a vaccination, why do you think the government understands that requirement better than the very healthcare professional who not only treats this but was exposed to it, who has natural immunities, and who understands the side effects; not only of the disease but of the vaccination.

Once again, I submit to you that it is time to let healthcare professionals make their own decisions, especially when it comes to their own lives. They are the ones that put their lives on the line during the pandemic. They are the ones that treated the sick patients. They are the ones that know best whether a vaccination will benefit them or harm them, not a government.

I must also remind you that our Constitution is based on individual rights, not on a collective governance by politicians telling people what to do in things they don't know about.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we support the Freedom for Healthcare Workers Act.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENTS OF ANGELO K. TSAKOPOULOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the lifetime achievements of Angelo K. Tsakopoulos.

Mr. Tsakopoulos' story is a story of the American Dream. Angelo immigrated to the United States from Greece at the age of 15. He worked hard. He didn't have a whole lot but went into the real estate business to help pay for his education at California State University, Sacramento. He built a real estate company.

Angelo helped shape Sacramento over his life. The Sacramento Bee has identified Mr. Tsakopoulos potentially as the most influential Sacramentan since John Sutter. His contributions, not just to our community but to philanthropy, to education, and to the arts are outstanding.

Mr. Tsakopoulos also never forgot his roots in Greece. This Monday he will receive lifetime recognition for his service to Hellenism. He established multiple foundations and organizations to celebrate the values and the culture of his homeland.

He also, through his family, continues to do public service through his daughter Eleni who is our Lieutenant Governor in California. On Monday, February 6, all of us in Sacramento, the United States, and all Greek Americans recognize the contributions of Angelo Tsakopoulos and his family; contributions to preserving Greek culture.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the first day of Black History Month to recognize the importance of studying African-American history and Black history in the United States.

It is incredibly important for us to recognize Black history and teach it not only to our young students from elementary school to middle school to high school, but to all Americans. We have to understand the good and the bad. We have to understand the legacy of slavery, Jim Crow, and mass incarceration.

We need to understand—as I stand her on the floor of the House of Representatives in the United States Capitol, a beacon of democracy and freedom—that this is a building that was built by enslaved people. It is important for us to understand that because we need to recognize that and get better at teaching that to future generations of Americans.

We also need to recognize the accomplishments of a few individuals: the moral character of our former colleague, John Lewis, who really was the moral backbone of this institution; the first President that I served under, Barack Obama, the accomplishments, not just as President but as a great human being, father, and husband; my close friend, the first female Vice President, the first African-American Vice President, the first Asian-American Vice President, Vice President KAMALA HARRIS who is a role model for my daughter and future women across the spectrum in the United States; and

our good friend, the minority leader of the Democratic Party, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, someone who we are all proud of.

Let's understand African-American history. Let's teach it. Let's not try to erase the parts that we don't want to teach. If we don't teach Black history, we will be condemned to repeat some of those mistakes. We need to learn from the past, and we need to get better. Let's teach it to all of our students.

HONORING KEN COOLEY

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Assemblyman Ken Cooley for his decades of service to Sacramento County and the State of California.

Ken served in the California State Assembly for 10 years representing the Eighth Assembly District, which covered the eastern half of Sacramento County.

Assemblyman Cooley started his public service career in Sacramento as the chief of staff to the State assemblyman, and later as chief counsel to the Assembly Finance and Insurance Committee.

He was elected to the Rancho Cordova's first city council in 2002 and twice served as mayor to Rancho Cordova. Ken was a constant presence and continues to be a constant presence throughout our community.

I have had the privilege to go to many events with Ken, and he is a close friend. He is an Eagle Scout, as well, and his commitment to Scouting helped recognize youth achievement through the Boy Scouts of America.

The City of Rancho Cordova and all of us in Sacramento County are better off thanks to his hard work and determination, and I wish him all the best in the next chapter of his life.

AMERICANS HAVE THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Americans have a fundamental right to keep and bear arms that shall not be infringed.

The unelected bureaucrats at the ATF do not have the constitutional authority to ban guns and violate the Second Amendment rights of American citizens.

I am proud to join my colleagues to fight to block Joe Biden's pistol brace gun ban and also to fight to defund the ATF.

□ 1030

In Illinois, Governor Pritzker signed an unconstitutional gun ban that violates the Second Amendment rights of my constituents. Joe Biden and J.B. Pritzker's policies released dangerous criminals and defund the police, and then they want to take our Second Amendment right to defend ourselves.

I am a proud member of the House Freedom Caucus and the House Second

Amendment Caucus. We are united in our opposition to these unconstitutional attacks on the rights of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I will always stand for our constitutional rights and protect our Second Amendment rights in Congress.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Social Security coverage is an earned benefit. In January, Social Security beneficiaries began to see an 8.7 percent cost-of-living increase, the largest since 1981. This COLA covers retirees as well as workers who become disabled and surviving children under age 18 whose working parents died.

For nearly a century, America has honored the sacred insurance promise intergenerationally. Those who work throughout their lives will benefit from the fruits of their labor.

Yes, this historic cost-of-living adjustment will help Americans manage their cost of living to pay bills and put food on the table. In addition, millions of Medicare users will now only pay \$35 per month for insulin. This cost savings will benefit hundreds of thousands of Ohioans.

The Social Security COLA along with affordable insulin are being championed by congressional Democrats. We know the foundation of financial stability for over 66 million retired Americans is their earned social insurance benefits. Respecting their lives and their work, Democrats will always honor Social Security and vote to protect it and to strengthen Medicare.

FUND NEW GREAT LAKES AUTHORITY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to also call upon President Biden to fund the new Great Lakes Authority in the administration's fiscal year 2024 budget request.

With support from our Great Lakes colleagues, the Great Lakes Authority was authorized in the fiscal year 2023 omnibus appropriations bill and signed into law on January 2, 2023.

Across America, regional development instrumentalities like this have existed for decades. Until now, the Great Lakes region was the one major region left out of our Nation's toolkit for regional cooperation, reinvestment, and revitalization.

Launched initially with Federal resources to drive economic and environmental recovery, this authority now exists and aims to become self-sufficient sooner rather than later. This new year brings new opportunities for public-private partnerships across our Great Lakes region for investment and revitalization.

The Great Lakes Authority will harness the region's strengths, which include stewardship of the largest body of freshwater on the continent and on

Earth. Our region is home to America's industrial and agricultural strength. We have hardworking men and women who manufacture the majority of automobiles and trucks this Nation manufactures, as well as, of course, farmers in our agricultural heartland who feed us all. We have these massive production assets in this region.

Finally, the wealth of the region has allowed for an array of educational and corporate institutions, as well, which now can be mobilized together to reboot and repurpose the region's recovery from massive job outsourcing and, frankly, outright neglect that has damaged its potential for far too long.

Investing to strengthen the Great Lakes heartland will usher in a new era for our communities. It is time to fund the Great Lakes Authority to be the key economic development engine that becomes self-supporting through public-private partnerships that make a lasting impact.

Onward Great Lakes Authority.

There is no time like the present to launch a stronger and more hopeful future for every community across our precious region.

PROTECTING WOMEN'S AND GIRLS' SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, sports and athletic competitions provide essential opportunities for women to thrive at every stage of their life, as children in youth sports and as teens in high school and in college, in order to live a healthy and productive life.

As a former competitive athlete, an equestrian, a basketball player, a golfer, and, yes, the teenage curling champion of 1975 in my hometown, I know the unparalleled opportunities that sports offer to women and girls.

Competitive sports give women a chance to learn new skills, to develop lifelong friendships, and to challenge themselves to compete at the highest levels. Title IX and the banning of discrimination against women in sports made so much of this possible for me and countless other women.

Today, these opportunities are under threat. Joe Biden's Department of Education and State agencies across the Nation are allowing, even encouraging, biological men to participate in women's sports. This is fundamentally unfair. It deprives women and girls of what so many of us fought for decades to achieve: equal opportunity to train, to compete, and to excel in athletics.

We witnessed this past year, during the NCAA women's swimming championship, a phenomenal female athlete robbed of her title by a biological male. This is not an isolated incident. The tragedy is playing out in countless other sports and athletic leagues across our Nation.

Today, we take a stand, with compassion for all, in defense of women's

sports to stop this dangerous precedent.

I am honored to be joined by an amazing group of outstanding women athletes who are in our Chamber today and are courageously standing up for women in all sports across our Nation and all women athletes.

This is why I am so honored to co-sponsor Representative GREG STEUBE's Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act and to announce its introduction today in honor of National Women and Girls in Sports Day.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the legislation. This bill will make it a violation of Title IX for biological men to compete in sports designated for women or girls. Further, it sensibly defines sex based on one's biological designation at birth.

This bill isn't just anti-woke. It is actually pro-science. This bill will protect opportunities for women and girls to compete fairly on the athletic field and in life without interference from woke agencies or politicians who are making up definitions of sex and gender as they go, all to fit toxic political agendas and ideologies.

Women have fought hard over the years for equality of opportunity, and it is essential that we protect these opportunities we cherish today for generations of women and girls to come.

The Republican majority has pledged to protect women's sports, and today, we are delivering on that promise with Congressman STEUBE's bill.

Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce Mr. STEUBE's bill today.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC SCHEME HURTS WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, the work of Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, is to advance the well-being, security, and economic growth of the American people.

Let me define for you, Mr. Speaker, who the American people are. For all of us as Members of Congress, that looks very different.

For me in my district, it means the young entrepreneur who is eager and excited about starting a new business, a startup company.

It is the middle-aged couple who have government jobs and who have worked diligently, scrimped and saved to buy a home, and are now looking for financing and support to send their children to college.

It is the veteran who has served this country and now has to navigate through the bureaucracy of the Federal Government to get those rights and privileges that, having served this country, he or she deserves.

It is the senior citizen and the retiree who are always watching their budget to make sure that they have enough to

meet all of their bills and somehow get by.

Those are the people and the families whom I fight for. I know that, on my side of the aisle, those workers, parents, seniors, and young people are whom we, as Democrats, are fighting for. While we may come from different families with different standings, beliefs, and statuses, that is whom we all should be working for in this Chamber.

Presently, however, the House Republican economic scheme will only hurt working American families, whom we say we are here to support. As Congress, as the House of Representatives of the people, we must, in partnership with the President, continue to enact legislation to protect the financial security of American working families.

That is why I am directly calling on my colleagues, the Republican Conference members, to begin the work of legislating for the American people—the majority of Americans, not the performative politics required by an extreme social media fringe—with legislation to help work out the best possibilities to solve the growing challenges that our families, the American people, face every day.

The current Republican-led plan to cut taxes in favor of the wealthy does not help lower- and middle-income families. Instead, it increases our national deficit and makes inflation worse.

The dismantling of Social Security will be devastating to retirees, who have paid into that system and believe that it is something that they are going to have to live out their best days yet.

Likewise, allowing for prescription drug prices and health insurance premiums to rise while simultaneously allowing for an increasing energy bill and student loan payments only make it harder for families to financially stay afloat and take care of their health.

In the last Congress, the 117th Congress, President Biden and House Democrats forged extraordinary progress, working in a bipartisan manner in the other Chamber, for American working families with many consequential new laws.

They include the American Rescue Plan, which kick-started the fastest and strongest jobs recovery in modern times, creating more than 10 million jobs in just 2 years; the infrastructure law, which put Americans back to work while simultaneously rebuilding our roads, bridges, ports, and water systems; the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which deploys stronger tools to keep guns out of dangerous hands; the PACT Act, which ensures that veterans who are exposed to toxic chemicals while protecting our Nation can access the healthcare services they need; the CHIPS and Science Act, which will power American preeminence in science, innovation, and manufacturing, strengthen our national security, and bring jobs back to

America for decades to come; and the Inflation Reduction Act, which slashed prescription drug costs and lowered healthcare premiums, delivering the most consequential climate action in history and reducing the Federal deficit.

All of this progress can continue if we continue to work to legislate and not to perform for cameras and social media. To work for the American people is incumbent on us all—Democrats, Republicans, all of us—to work together to protect the health, security, and freedom of American families.

ANTI-SEMITISM: NEVER AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me, just for a start, say that hatred and discrimination against any marginalized community are wrong, whether it be an ethnic minority, LGBT, a person with a disability, and women and girls.

Today, I want to focus on something that is personal to me.

My family was blessed. My grandfather came over to this country from Poland just before the rise of Hitler, and he saved his brothers and sisters by bringing them over. Too many people were not so blessed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and start my comments by saying, “never again,” as I address the growing concern of anti-Semitism in my home State of Florida and across the country.

□ 1045

This rise in anti-Semitism is deeply concerning, particularly given the lessons of the Holocaust, where we lost 6 million Jews and millions of others who were murdered by the Nazis in one of the worst human atrocities in the history of the world. These were precious lives who were tortured, gassed, shot, and treated as less than human.

It is terrifying that we find ourselves today having to defend the fact that it even happened. So we say “never again” to remind the world that we just didn’t wake up one moment to gas chambers and genocide; it was a slow and deliberate effort, dehumanizing Jews and others, fomenting fear and normalizing extremism and prejudice.

Today, Holocaust denial and anti-Semitism is on the rise. Incidents of anti-Semitism reported—and this is just reported—to the Anti-Defamation League have risen by 34 percent in their last report. There were over 2,700 incidents that were reported in a year: Harassment, assaults, Molotov cocktails thrown at synagogues, defacing Jewish cemeteries, I could go on and on. The point is, it is clear that anti-Semitism is real.

In my own community in Palm Beach County, which is home to tens of thousands of Jews, this past January

there were Nazi symbols projected on buildings and hundreds and hundreds of anti-Semitic flyers thrown into the yards of people.

Mr. Speaker, I say what should we do? What must we do?

Combating anti-Semitism is everyone’s responsibility. There is something for all of us to do to promote a more inclusive and respectful society.

Let me just give a to-do list. It is not necessarily inclusive, but some things that we should all take to heart.

Believe it or not, a significant number of our young people don’t have any understanding of the Holocaust; and so, of course, education and awareness about the Holocaust and the history of anti-Semitism and the harm it causes, education is something that is very important.

All of us must speak out and condemn anti-Semitism wherever and whenever it occurs, whether it is using your voice, your Facebook page, your Twitter, writing letters to the editor. If you see something, you must say something.

We should be working with our great partners across different sectors and levels of government to combat anti-Semitism and protect our Jewish communities, partners like the ADL, the American Jewish Committee, and many others.

We have to keep our houses of worship safe, not just synagogues, but churches and mosques. People must be free in this country to go to a house of worship and feel safe.

We must support the laws and policies that protect people and communities from discrimination, extremism, hate crimes, and improve hate crime reporting and prosecuting hate crimes.

Mr. Speaker, let me just refer to a magnificent hero in my community, Ben Ferencz, the last living Nuremberg prosecutor, who tells us that creating a world of tolerance and compassion would be a long and arduous task, a task we must all take up in words and actions.

Mr. Speaker, we must build bridges between different communities through dialogues and collaborations that can help to reduce prejudice and foster mutual respect, and it means standing against hatred aimed at other often marginalized groups.

And we must protect the safety and security of Israel, the homeland of 46 percent of the world’s Jews.

As I conclude my remarks, I want to highlight the story of Ben Ferencz, a magnificent hero from my community.

Ben, who at 103 years old, is the last living Nuremberg prosecutor and was recently bestowed the Congress’ highest honor, a Congressional Gold Medal.

As World War II engulfed Europe, after graduating from law school, Ben enlisted in the U.S. Army.

He was transferred to a unit responsible for gathering evidence of Nazi war crimes.

He later took that evidence to the chief Nuremberg prosecutor, and at 27 years old, Ben was appointed the lead prosecutor of the biggest murder trial in the history of the world

where he convicted 22 Nazi leaders for their roles in the deaths of over 1 million people.

Ben went on to spend his life pursuing peace and justice.

CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the Biden administration to close the disposable e-cigarette loophole. I commend this administration’s work to curtail youth e-cigarette use. Youth usage of cigarettes and vaping is at a historic low, but the FDA’s guidance issued by the previous administration in January 2020 that prohibits flavored e-cigarettes does not apply to any of the disposable e-cigarette products currently on the market.

It is important to note that non-disposable products with cartridge inserts are already banned by the FDA, but the loophole on disposable e-cigarettes has allowed a surge in youth usage, according to the Centers for Disease Control 2022 National Youth Tobacco Study. The study shows that usage is up by 2,000 percent since 2019.

It is a dangerous oversight that can easily be fixed by closing the Trump-era loophole. Disposable e-cigarettes are single use. They are not meant to be refilled or recharged.

Right now, in smoke shops and corner stores around the country, you might see dozens of disposable e-cigarette products in flavors like iced apple mango, strawberry, pineapple, and even lemonade. These products are sleek, affordable, pocket-sized, and highly accessible to our youth.

The President can take immediate action by closing this Trump-era loophole. The future and safety of American youth depends on this.

REJECTING AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY IS WRONG

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, last week Florida Governor Ron DeSantis’ administration blocked a new advanced placement African-American history course from being taught in Florida high schools, arguing that the course violates State law and is historically inaccurate.

The DeSantis administration’s rejection of the AP course is unfathomable, unsound, and unacceptable. Instead of improving and expanding on the quality of education for Florida high school students, this administration’s extreme agenda aims to roll back the clock by denying its students the right to explore the painful, complex, and rich history of African Americans in our country.

The rejection of this course is an attempt to erase from our memory the truth about how hate and bigotry has destroyed our Nation’s moral fabric and ushered in one of the darkest moments of United States history.

Governor Ron DeSantis claimed that he wants to protect students from

“woke indoctrination,” but what he really wants to do is to deny the truth by making bigoted relics and policies more digestible for future generations.

It is only when we acknowledge and learn from our past that we can embrace the present and confidently shape our future.

This blatant attack on the importance and value of African-American history and culture fails to move our States and our country forward. It is these theatrics and schemes by the GOP that cripple our Nation's growth and exemplify a poor reflection of who we are as a nation.

America's diversity is, in fact, its greatest strength, and every culture has to be respected and celebrated.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 53 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Intercede in our lives, O Lord, even as we offer prayers of intercession for others. While we offer our petitions and thanksgiving for our leaders and all who are in authority, with our voices we also pray for those who have no voice, for those who have no hope, and for those who don't know how or what to pray in the moments they are now enduring.

Hear our prayers for the individuals we know and name in our hearts who are grieving loss or suffering illness. For too many who are mute with pain and despair, may the prayers from our lips reach You on their behalf.

Hear our prayers for our communities and our country who are fractured by the tragedies of violence in all its forms. For the many cities and neighborhoods disrupted with animosity and distrust, may the prayers we offer together in this place bring forth a comity to be found only in You.

Hear our prayers for the war-torn countries around the world and for their citizens who suffer from abuses of power, the deprivation of religious liberties, and the brutal oppression of human rights. For these who are prohibited from praying, may our prayers be louder and stronger than the adversary who seeks to silence them.

You alone are sovereign, O God. May our faith be found righteous before You

that our prayers would be powerful and effective on behalf of Your people.

In the strength of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the Chamber the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING PENN STATE UNIVERSITY'S WORLD CAMPUS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Penn State University's World Campus on 25 years of online learning.

In 1998, Penn State World Campus launched its first online courses. Since then, those initial courses have expanded to more than 175 degrees and certificate programs, and almost 34,000 students have graduated with a Penn State degree they earned online.

Through the past 25 years, the leadership of World Campus has remained dedicated to helping students to reach their goals. The creation of World Campus allows students to find success in a flexible way. Students who wanted a Penn State degree but could not go to a campus have access to an extensive selection of associate, bachelor's, and master's degree programs.

In fact, Penn State World Campus is ranked number five on Military Times "Best for Vets" list and named "Guard-Friendly" by the Pennsylvania National Guard Associations.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud Penn State alumnus, the World Campus gives students of all backgrounds and ages the ability to be able to find success and join the extensive Penn State community.

Congratulations, Penn State World Campus, we can't wait to see what the next 25 years have in store.

We are.

RAISING THE NATION'S DEBT CEILING

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about what has been and should always be a bipartisan issue, raising our Nation's debt ceiling.

Raising America's debt ceiling ensures we do not default on our financial obligations to those we have borrowed from and prevents economic catastrophe in the process. Don't take my word for it.

Listen to American businesses, economists, and financial institutions who know the drastic consequences a debt default would have for the U.S. economy and working Americans.

The business roundtable, which represents the CEOs of some of the Nation's largest companies, has said about raising the debt limit: "Failure to lift the Federal debt limit to meet U.S. obligations would produce an otherwise avoidable crisis and pose an unacceptable risk to the Nation's economic growth, job creation and financial markets."

If you don't want to take their word for it, I recommend heeding these words:

"The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate." Those are the words of President Ronald Reagan.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S PR STUNT TO TOUR SMALL BUSINESS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Vice President traveled to North Carolina to tout the Biden administration's so-called accomplishments in helping our Nation's small businesses.

Well, the American people can see through the Vice President's PR stunt and know sky-high inflation, worker shortages, and supply chain disruptions are nothing to celebrate.

I have been a small business owner for 52 years and still am, and I know these economic headwinds job creators are facing firsthand.

The reality is small businesses are worse off due to this administration's disastrous policies and out-of-control Washington spending.

As the chairman of the Small Businesses Committee, I welcome anyone who wants to celebrate entrepreneurship and recognize our great small businesses.

However, no amount of media events will change the dire reality Main Street continues to experience under

this administration's 2-year crackdown on job creators.

More needs to be done to unleash the full potential of Main Street, and the direction must change before anyone goes on a victory lap or asks for a trophy.

In God We Trust.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, the first day of Black History Month to honor Black history as American history.

Black history is about the sung and unsung Black heroes and sheroes who have contributed to our Nation's progress—from the Revolutionary War to the fight against COVID and everything in between.

Therefore, we say thank you to the Black Americans who stand for justice, for voting rights, for women's rights, for saving Black lives, for better healthcare, climate reform, and education. I believe whether it is teaching AP Black history courses or standing on this House floor—that when we acknowledge the unique struggle of Black Americans through history—we grow closer to our Nation's highest ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will take time this month to learn and truly understand Black history is American history.

FENTANYL CRISIS

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, deceptive drugs made of fentanyl are killing young people and destroying lives in southern California and across our Nation at an alarming rate.

In California, fentanyl is responsible for one out of every five youth deaths.

The top source of fentanyl is the U.S.-Mexico border, and last year, 60 percent of fentanyl found in 2022 was at southern California ports of entry in San Diego and Imperial counties near my district.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department seized more than 400 pounds of suspected fentanyl, and nearly 400,000 pills suspected to contain fentanyl during the first 10 months in 2022.

I will keep fighting for solutions to secure our border and prevent these drugs from entering our schools, streets, neighborhoods, and homes.

ADDICTION CRISIS IN EVERY COMMUNITY

(Mr. PAPPAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the addiction crisis that continues to impact just about every community and every family across this country.

Many of us have lost neighbors, friends, and loved ones. Despite significant efforts at all levels of government, recent statistics show the problem is worsening.

My hometown of Manchester saw a 22 percent increase in opioid-related overdoses last year and a 41 percent increase in opioid-related deaths. We must do more to confront this crisis to support those who are suffering from substance use disorder and to stop the trafficking of fentanyl and its analogues.

These substances, which authorities are now finding in nearly all illicit drugs, have only made this crisis more and more deadly.

That is why last week, alongside Representatives DAN NEWHOUSE and TONY GONZALES, I reintroduced the Save Americans from the Fentanyl Emergency Act. Our bill would permanently schedule all fentanyl-related substances as Schedule I drugs. This would ensure that law enforcement retains an important tool to get these deadly drugs off the streets and hold traffickers accountable. It will help save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER OKLAHOMA CITY ASIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(Mrs. BICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the launch of the Greater Oklahoma City Asian Chamber of Commerce, which will empower businesses and support the economic growth of the Asian community in Oklahoma.

The Asian community is one of the fastest growing populations in the Nation and in Oklahoma, with nearly 50,000 Asian residents and more than 5,300 businesses in the greater Oklahoma City metro area, resulting in \$203 million in payroll and \$1.2 billion in sales.

Clearly, the Asian community has fostered great innovation and boosted our local economy. I am proud to serve such a vibrant community and am grateful for their remarkable contributions to the district.

Thank you to the incredible leaders and entrepreneurs who have created this new chamber that will benefit the community and beyond.

I am particularly grateful for the leadership of Scarlet Le-Cao and her vision in starting the Greater Oklahoma City Asian American Chamber of Commerce. Her leadership will be vital for years to come.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF PAUL WOODS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the incredible life and service of World War II veteran Paul Woods.

Mr. Woods joined the United States Army in 1941. During the war, he bravely fought for America's freedoms abroad and racism at home.

Mr. Woods is known to say: "A bullet knows no race, rank, or status. We were all brothers on the battlefield."

On February 20, Mr. Woods will celebrate his 100th birthday. It is my honor to celebrate this American hero and to thank him for his selfless service on behalf of a grateful Nation.

RECOGNIZING SHARON JOHNSON'S 35 YEARS OF SERVICE

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise today to honor an incredible woman, my deputy chief of staff, Sharon Johnson. Today marks Sharon's 35 years of service to Mississippi's Third Congressional District.

Sharon was born and raised in Louisville, Mississippi, and began her career in Washington, D.C., under the legendary G.V. Sonny Montgomery and has served our district under all three Members of Congress since: Congressman Chip Pickering, Congressman Gregg Harper, and now I am blessed that she has been a member of my team since day one.

Over the past 35 years, Sharon has proven to be a true asset to the people of Mississippi's Third Congressional District. Her unwavering commitment to service and community has earned her the respect and admiration of those who have had the privilege of working with her.

Today, we honor Sharon and celebrate her service. I am hopeful that Sharon's record of public service will inspire future generations of young women to consider this important work.

On behalf of Mississippi's Third Congressional District, I extend my sincere thanks to Sharon Johnson for her 35 years of unwavering service.

□ 1215

HONORING GREENSBORO FOUR

(Ms. MANNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, on this day 63 years ago, four courageous North Carolina A&T students, Franklin McCain, Jibreel Khazan, Joseph McNeil, and David Richmond, staged a sit-in at the Whites-only lunch counter

of the Woolworth Department Store in Greensboro, North Carolina, after they were refused service.

They came to be known as the Greensboro Four. In the days to come, their peaceful protest grew as they were joined by students from Bennett College and Dudley High School.

Their courageous actions inspired over 700,000 people across the Nation to participate in sit-ins, sparking a revolution that moved our Nation forward in the fight for civil rights.

Today, as we celebrate the first day of Black History Month, we remember their legacy, which is honored at the International Civil Rights Center and Museum that is in that very Woolworth's building in Greensboro.

I am proud to co-lead a resolution with Congresswoman ADAMS to encourage States to include the Greensboro sit-ins in school curriculums.

HONORING JAN LENTZ

(Mr. PFLUGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a lifelong public servant and valuable member of the Texas-11 team, Mrs. Jan Lentz.

For 7 years, Jan has devoted her time and talents to our district as a constituent services aide. She previously served with the VA, West Texas Counseling and Guidance, and many other organizations and has led a veterans support group for over 15 years, most of this as a volunteer.

Jan's impact on our community exceeds everything beyond words, and her service has extended far beyond our district. She has literally impacted thousands of lives, veteran lives and family member lives, and so many in need in our community.

Over the years, Jan has secured countless benefits for veterans and has impacted thousands of veteran families. Last year alone, she returned over \$100,000 in taxes back to constituents.

Jan is someone who we all wish we could be.

As she moves into the next phase of her life in retirement, we want Jan to know that we are grateful for her service. We are grateful for what she has done for our community, veterans, and so many people in need.

I say thank you to Jan from the bottom of our hearts, from our team, our district, and the State of Texas. We all wish Jan good luck in retirement.

COMMENDING PENNSYLVANIA HERO BENJAMIN STEIDINGER

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the 1-year anniversary of the heroism of Benjamin Steidinger, of Germansville, Pennsylvania.

When Benjamin saw smoke coming from a house across his street, he didn't just call 911. He climbed up a ladder to the second story, knocked out a window, and crawled across the floor, where he rescued two women, a baby, and a dog from the smoke and flames.

Benjamin thought he might not make it out of that house alive, but he put his life at risk in sacrifice for others. He is among the best of us.

Today, I commend Benjamin for representing and living out the values of our community: grit, determination, and courage in the face of immense challenges.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Seventh District, we thank Benjamin for his courage.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY J. BENEZETTE

(Mr. ALFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great man, Deputy J. Benezette from the Cass County Sheriff's Office who recently received the Life Saving Award.

Deputy Benezette was on his way home from an extra duty assignment at the sheriff's office and heard a dispatch call. An incident had happened nearby, and he answered that call for service.

Deputy Benezette got on the scene, where two motor vehicles were involved in an accident. One vehicle was completely overturned and had water pouring into it. With two people trapped inside and one struggling to keep her head above water, Deputy Benezette was able to quickly rescue both of them, saving a life and preventing a drowning.

His actions show dedication to duty under the most extreme circumstances, and he has been recognized with the Life Saving Award by his department.

Deputy Benezette serves Cass County and our Fourth District faithfully. He is a hero for our community and will be our guest at the State of the Union Address next week.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him and every member of our law enforcement community across America for the service they do for us.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS RAISE TAXES ON FAMILIES, CUT BENEFITS FOR SENIORS

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 83rd anniversary of the first Social Security check being issued. Since then, Democrats have worked to protect and strengthen Social Security, which has kept seniors from poverty and helped ensure a secure economic future for working Americans.

This year, Social Security beneficiaries received an 8.7 percent cost-of-living adjustment, the largest increase in decades.

While 70 million Americans are benefiting from this increase today, Republicans are working hard to slash Social Security and Medicare. To add further insult to injury, the Republican economic scheme includes a 30 percent sales tax that will impact every American family.

Our children, our families, and our seniors do not deserve to carry the undue financial burden of Republican tax breaks for large corporations and billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to realign their priorities and start working for the people.

FAILING DEMOCRATIC POLICIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a result of failing policies by Biden and the Democrat-led Congress, American families continue to feel the impact of 40-year-high inflation in their pocketbooks. Last year, the cost of everyday products and services rose exponentially, destroying jobs.

Since Biden took office, there has been a \$10 trillion increase in spending above projections, \$2.5 million increase on interest payments on growing Federal debt, \$1.9 trillion on the American Rescue Plan, \$745 billion on the inflation expansion act, \$3.4 trillion on the infrastructure investment act, and \$1 trillion in Biden executive actions.

This irresponsible spending has hurt all Americans, and we must address it. The newly elected House Republican majority, ably led by Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY, is committed to creating jobs and a government that is accountable to the people. We must reestablish fiscal sanity.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues, moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

Just yesterday, another terrorist was caught crossing the southern border.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS SAFE WITH REPUBLICANS

(Mr. MCCORMICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 days, I have heard repeatedly the other side of the House say that Republicans want to cut Social Security or reduce spending on Social Security and reduce benefits from Social Security.

I will call that a lie. Just because you repeat it multiple times does not

make it a fact, Mr. Speaker. I actually asked around my entire delegation, my entire caucus: Does anyone want to reduce spending on Social Security? Not one person said yes. As a matter of fact, everybody said no.

As a caucus, we have discussed this multiple times, both on the floor and in conference, and we have all unanimously said that we are not going to reduce spending on Social Security.

As a matter of fact, I will challenge anybody who says differently to show me in writing where this secret document exists or where the secret statement exists because I haven't seen it.

I want to take this opportunity to express that just because you say it doesn't make it fact. The fact is that no Republican is talking about reducing spending on Social Security as a caucus.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 84

Resolved, That the following named member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Guest, Chair.

Mr. RESCENTIALER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO COMPOSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 12, as amended by section 1(c) of House Resolution 78, the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with not more than 19 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 8 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 9, DENOUNCING THE HORRORS OF SOCIALISM; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 76, REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 provides for consideration of two resolutions under a closed rule. They are H. Con. Res. 9 and H. Res. 76.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying resolutions.

H. Con. Res. 9 is a simple resolution denouncing the horrors of socialism in all forms and opposes the implementation of socialist policy here in the United States.

This resolution should not be controversial. Socialism is a harmful ideology that is opposed to everything the United States stands for. Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin both described and demonstrated how socialism is a transition period between capitalism and communism.

We have seen this time and time again. Socialist ideology creates a concentration of power that leads to communist regimes, totalitarian rule, and brutal dictatorships that deprive their citizens of basic freedoms and human rights.

We have seen the horrors of communism through the tens of millions killed by regimes in China, the Soviet Union, North Korea, Cambodia, and elsewhere, horrors that some of my colleagues across the aisle refused to even condemn yesterday during the Rules Committee hearing on this.

Even today, hundreds of thousands of Russians, Chinese, Cambodians, Koreans, Cubans, and Venezuelans have fled from murderous communist dictatorships and have legally resettled here in the United States. They are a living testament to the barbarity of these socialist regimes and the promise of the American Dream.

It is essential for Congress to condemn the atrocities committed in the name of socialism and prevent any socialist policies from being implemented in the United States.

Additionally, the rule before us provides for consideration H. Res. 76, a resolution that would remove Representative ILHAN OMAR from her seat on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Representative OMAR has a repeated history of making deplorable and despicable anti-Semitic remarks and does not deserve to sit on the committee directly overseeing U.S. international policy, partnerships, and national security.

In fact, the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a Democrat, Representative Eliot Engel, claimed that such comments made by Representative OMAR have "no place in the Foreign Affairs Committee or the House of Representatives."

Compared to the actions taken by my Democratic colleagues last Congress, I think that we Republicans are being incredibly generous in only removing Representative ILHAN OMAR from the Foreign Affairs Committee instead of from all her committee assignments, which we are clearly in our right to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCENTIALER), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am confused, Mr. Speaker, because after months of hearing from Republicans that they want to address bread

and butter issues, that they want to do something about the issues facing everyday people in this country, the issues that we hear about when we go home, we are here instead wasting the time of this body with two useless, stupid, political stunts which are about dividing people, distracting people.

Make no mistake, these are FOX News talking points, Tucker Carlson sound bites, press releases. That is what they are. And the reason why is clear.

When Democrats were in charge, we had one of the most productive Congresses in history. We passed the biggest climate change bill ever. We passed the biggest infrastructure bill since the interstate highways were built. We passed a bipartisan gun violence bill, stood up to greedy corporations, lifted kids out of poverty, and brought jobs and manufacturing back to America.

What are Republicans doing? What are they pushing instead of kitchen-table issues?

Conspiracy theories, nationwide abortion bans, a 30 percent national sales tax on groceries and gas, cuts to Social Security and Medicare, giveaways to billionaire corporations so they can cheat on their taxes; that is the kind of garbage that they are wasting the American people's time on.

H. Con. Res. 9 claims to denounce the horrors of socialism. What is this, the Red Scare?

I have to say, this is about the stupidest bill I have ever seen. Just a stupid, stupid, stupid bill.

Let me just say to my Democratic colleagues, vote however you want on this. It doesn't matter because it does nothing at all.

Oh, it denounces Pol Pot. Of course, we denounce Pol Pot. I have never heard anyone say anything nice about him.

We denounce Stalin. I didn't know that that needed a resolution.

We denounce Kim Jong-Un. Well, not all of us actually, because, in fact, if I remember correctly, it was the leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, who said he fell in love with him, who talked about how talented he was, who called him a great leader, who bragged about their chemistry.

Did any of my Republican colleagues speak up when a brutal tyrant named in this resolution was applauded on the world stage by the President of the United States? Did they denounce that?

What is interesting, Mr. Speaker, one name I notice was missing from this list: Vladimir Putin. What is up with that?

I mean, we condemn Lenin and Stalin but not Putin? Is that a Trump thing? Did he put in a call? Seriously, why is Putin left out?

By the way, this isn't just a stupid bill, it is a badly written stupid bill. It lays out all of these awful people and then says, "We are rejecting the implementation of socialist policies in the United States of America."

Nobody, not a single person so far, has been willing to clarify for me what exactly that means, what the hell they are talking about.

Are we talking about public schools here? Fire departments? Roads?

What about Medicare and Social Security?

Republicans have called Medicare and Social Security socialist programs for years.

We would just like a little clarification here, and we got none last night in the Rules Committee. None. We even tried to include an amendment to clarify that the language here does not imply cuts to Social Security and Medicare. Every Republican, every single Republican on the Rules Committee voted "no." There is our answer. There is our answer.

Here is what I think: I think this is about scaring people, and it is about dividing people, and it is about distracting people.

That brings me to our next resolution, which removes our colleague Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR from the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I mean, the hypocrisy here is staggering. It literally takes my breath away.

Congresswoman OMAR has apologized for the things that she said. She said she wants to be an ally in the fight against anti-Semitism. She even voted to condemn anti-Semitism. Every Democrat did, as well.

You know who voted "no"? Twenty-three Republicans. Twenty-three Republicans voted against condemning anti-Semitism. Maybe the gentleman can explain whether or not they should be removed from their committees.

Then we gave our colleagues on the Rules Committee the chance to add an amendment to their socialism resolution condemning the mass murder of 6 million Jewish people by the Nazis, also known as the National Socialist German Workers' Party.

Guess what? They all voted "no." They all voted "no." Oh my God. Wow.

I keep hearing this both sides stuff, trying to make false equivalencies, saying the Democrats opened the door to removing her. Give me a break.

Congresswoman OMAR never posted a video pretending to kill another Member of Congress. She never advocated putting a bullet in the head of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. She never had dinner with Neo-Nazis Nick Fuentes and Kanye West. She never spoke at a white supremacy conference. She never said that she would have won January 6 because she was armed. No, those are things Republicans have done and have said.

I will ask again, why aren't those Members being removed, too?

Please, to my friends on the other side, please spare us the absurd comparisons and lectures about anti-Semitism. Republicans refuse to condemn anti-Semitism. Republicans refused to add an amendment condemning Nazis to this socialism resolution. Republicans have been silent while members

of their Conference say things that are blatantly anti-Semitic and appear beside Holocaust deniers and bigots.

These are awful, awful bills designed to divide and distract people. I get it. I mean, I get why. I would want to divide and distract people, too, if my agenda was as extreme as the agenda that the Speaker of the House is now advocating for.

They have spent their entire time in power so far pushing for higher gas prices, higher middle-class taxes, higher inflation, and higher drug costs. They are screwing working families, screwing poor people, and using stupid BS like this to distract from their plans to reward billionaire corporations and hurt working families.

In the middle of it all, they are threatening to trigger a default if we don't cut Social Security and Medicare. We can waste all the time in the world on these resolutions—and on the socialist resolution, again, I don't even care. This is such a waste of time. People can vote any way they want. I have just made it a habit to always vote "no" on stupid bills. This is a waste of our time and a waste of the American people's time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I remind my good friend from Massachusetts that I don't think you will find anybody on this side of the aisle or in this Chamber that is more of a hawk on Russia than me, and I would gladly condemn Vladimir Putin. Let's not forget, Putin is a Communist. This is a man who started his career as a KGB agent, so this resolution clearly covers Vladimir Putin. We all condemn him.

Additionally, I remind the gentleman that the first time I ever spoke on the House floor—I waited weeks to speak as a freshman. The first time I spoke, though, was on anti-Semitism. I spoke to condemn the shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Squirrel Hill, Pennsylvania. I remind my friends across the aisle that we have been mischaracterized by some of the comments that were just said.

But let's talk about who won't condemn socialists. We had a ranking member, Democratic ranking member in the Rules Committee hearing yesterday who was given the chance to condemn. She would not do it. She was given a chance to condemn Putin, would not do it; a chance to condemn Pol Pot, wouldn't do it; and a litany of other socialists and Communists. I just remind my friend from across the aisle that Members on his side refuse to condemn socialists and Communist dictators.

I find it rich that there is a question over the definition of socialism. Remember, for the last 2 years, my friends across the aisle couldn't even define the term "woman." We had that rigmarole where they couldn't define "woman" and refused to acknowledge

science, that there were different sexes. Now they split hairs between the difference between socialism and communism? It is absolutely laughable.

Let's just define "socialism," since we are here having this debate. Socialism is a political and economic theory of social organization which advocates that means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned by the community as a whole, and it is not me saying that socialism leads to communism. That is Marx saying that. That is Lenin saying that. Part of their entire theory was you had a transition period between capitalism and communism. That transition period they called, again, Lenin and Marx, they called that socialism. Let's be very clear what we are talking about. Let's not play games with language, especially when you can't even define incredibly basic terms that even kindergarten students could define.

Let's talk about what Representative OMAR has said, talking about that because I think it is important to put this in context.

In February of 2019 Representative OMAR tweeted, "It's all about the Benjamins baby" in reference to American support for Israel. She said that AIPAC was buying U.S. Representatives. House Speaker NANCY PELOSI and the entire Democratic leadership actually condemned Representative OMAR for these anti-Semitic comments.

Then, again, just to show this is a pattern, this isn't some one-off incident: February 27, 2019, she doubled down on her stance at a forum in Washington, D.C., when she said, "I want to talk about the political influence in this country that says it is okay for people to push for allegiance to a foreign country."

Clearly, she is going back to the trope that Jewish Americans have a dual loyalty between the United States and Israel. That offended Chairman Eliot Engel, who at the time was the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and he said, "It is unacceptable and deeply offensive to call into question the loyalty of fellow American citizens because of their political views, including support for the U.S.-Israel relationship. We all take the same oath. Worse, Representative OMAR's comments leveled that charge by invoking a vile anti-Semitic slur." Again, that is not me saying that. That is a former Democratic chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Further, in March 2019, Representative OMAR trivialized the terrorist attacks of September 11 that killed just about 3,000 U.S. citizens by describing it as, "Some people did something." Her words.

In 2021, a few months before the death of 13 servicemembers during the botched withdrawal from Afghanistan, Representative OMAR compared servicemembers of the United States and the Israel Defense Forces to terrorist groups like Hamas and the Taliban. She tweeted, "We have seen unthinkable

atrocities committed by the U.S., Hamas, Israel, Afghanistan, and the Taliban."

To think that a Representative here in this body would equate the Israel Defense Forces and American servicemembers to Hamas and the Taliban speaks volumes. It is unacceptable. That person should not be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representative OMAR's Democratic colleagues sent a statement asking her to clarify those remarks because it was offensive and misguided. Again, the words of my colleagues across the aisle about Representative ILHAN OMAR's words, and she refused to apologize.

In May of 2021, Representative OMAR accused Israel of committing war crimes following days of conflict between Israel and Hamas, where Hamas was launching rockets into Israel that saw thousands of missiles fired indiscriminately at Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, killing civilians. She described Israel's defensive posture as war crimes, saying nothing about the terrorist attacks of Hamas.

So spare me the false outrage over her comments. She has proven time and time again that she should not be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR).

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to bring up H. Con. Res. 9, denouncing the horrors of socialism.

Why am I bringing this resolution to the floor of the United States House of Representatives?

Because young people in America are being brainwashed by the news media and academia into believing that socialism is an economic model for the greater good of all Americans. The problem is that they are falling for it. They are believing it.

Here is the proof: Almost 40 percent of Gen Z and millennials think "The Communist Manifesto," written by Karl Marx, the father of Marxism, is a better defense of freedom and equality than the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, one of the creators of the American experiment, American exceptionalism, and the document which gave birth to the most prosperous and resilient democracy in the history of the world, ours, the United States of America.

Worse yet, a recent poll shows that 40 percent of Americans of all ages, not only the youth, 40 percent believe that socialism is good, while 33 percent of them say that they are likely to support a member of the Democratic Socialists of America, the organization that has shaped the ideology of many of our colleagues with the poison of neo-Marxism. If you go to the Democratic Socialists of America website, you will read their neo-Marxist positions with pride.

□ 1245

I represent the 27th District in Florida, the city of Miami, a bastion of

hundreds of thousands of Cubans, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans who have fled, who have escaped from the despicable horrors that you cannot imagine produced by that ideology.

So why did the Venezuelans flee? Well, because Venezuela—why would they do that, if Venezuela has almost 20 percent of the world's oil? In other words, that means the largest reserves of oil in the world. The Venezuelans have more oil than the Saudis in Saudi Arabia. In the 1950s and 1960s, they had the same GDP as Germany. Now, inflation is 156 percent a year, the third largest in the world.

The average Venezuelan has lost 15 pounds for lack of food. In the last 20 years, over 7 million Venezuelans have escaped the democratic socialist paradise to anywhere they could go. That is more people than have fled the violence in Syria. So that indicates that socialism is more devastating than a civil war.

Another country who has lost everything is Nicaragua. In the 1970s, it was the breadbasket of Central America. Then the Sandinistas arrived, Daniel Ortega took power under the guidance of Fidel Castro in Cuba. He expropriated almost 30,000 properties in a few years. Right now, their citizens are poorer than they were in 1977. Ortega promised democratic socialism but delivered a dictatorship.

In the last Presidential election, seven people dared to run for President, and he put them all in jail. Still today, they are either under house arrest or in jail.

Every socialist is a dictator in disguise.

In Cuba, after 60 years of living the socialist paradise, the average Cuban, 70 percent of Cubans eat only once a day. The average Cubans makes \$23 a month. That is 40 cents a day. And the retirees, the seniors, make \$12.

Cuba, in 1960, had the highest per capita income in the hemisphere, and it was comparable to Italy. We know that because there is hunger—hunger is a very powerful motivator.

So today, Cubans by the thousands throw themselves to the sharks in the Straits of Florida looking for freedom and hoping to get to the district that I represent on this floor. That is just in this hemisphere.

In China, 55 million died. In Cambodia, 1 million. In the USSR, 10 million froze to death in the Gulags.

Socialists are in the business of power, and it only takes one generation to believe their false promise and lose their freedom. It is a lie that socialism will solve your problems, economic or social.

Democratic socialism is socialism, and socialism is always socialism.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this evil ideology take hold in this country. We are in the United States, the stronghold of freedom. That is why we must pass this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listen to this debate, and I get more and more confused.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that Vladimir Putin was not put on this list because he is a Communist, yet the gentleman mentioned communism several times.

The gentlewoman just talked about the Communist Manifesto, and I am looking at the list of people that are mentioned. Among them is Pol Pot, who I think everybody believes was viewed as a Communist.

So again, I am trying to figure out why wasn't Putin included on this list. Did somebody get a call from the Mar-a-Lago prison line that you couldn't put Putin on this list? I don't quite get it.

Again, I am also just stunned that last night, I mean, we offered the Gottheimer amendment. The language basically said that fascism led to the murder of 6 million Jewish people by the Nazi regime.

Everybody on the Republican side voted "no."

Again, we asked for some clarification on really what the guts of the bill were, which is the resolved clause.

What are you talking about? What policies are you against here in the United States? We asked to make the Takano amendment in order, which would have basically said that Social Security and Medicare would be exempt from any cuts if this was not what the intention was. Every one of the Republicans—every one of them—voted "no."

There was a gentleman who just came down on the floor saying, "I don't know why everybody is saying Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare."

You know why? Because of what happened last night in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, last night in the Committee on Rules, the Democrats offered an amendment that would clarify that any opposition to socialist policy implementation in the United States does not include existing Federal programs such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.

My Republican colleagues voted against it. We want to give them a second chance to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to include this important amendment and give every Member on the floor the opportunity to clarify that existing Federal programs like Social Security and Medicare are not under attack by this new Congress. Forgive us if we are concerned by rhetoric from many Members on the other side of the aisle past and present, give us pause.

Republicans have called Social Security a socialist program. I remember when Newt Gingrich wanted Medicare to wither on the vine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is the bedrock of our Nation's social safety net. Since its inception, it has lifted millions of our seniors out of poverty. Protecting the benefits it and other programs provide, should be a priority for this Congress. As my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying for our Nation's bills, we on the Democratic side are going to remain unified in doing everything we can to protect these important programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the amendment sponsor, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to rise today to offer an amendment which was a clarifying amendment, which would have clarified what the resolution before us today meant by the words "socialist" and "socialism."

None of us have any objection to, in fact, embrace the whereas clauses that we condemn egregious examples of totalitarian authoritarianism and the excesses thereof. But we are very concerned about what the resolved clause means and the way "socialism" is defined. There are many ways to look at socialism.

My amendment simply was to clarify that the implementation of any opposition of socialist policy in the United States does not include Federal programs such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.

But you know what? Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules last night blocked my amendment. The rejection of my amendment sends a clear message to the American people under this Republican majority.

Social Security and Medicare and veterans benefits are not safe because they construe those to be socialist programs.

This resolution being considered today is really ridiculous. It dishonestly conflates any effort to improve the lives of Americans with the violence of totalitarian Communist regimes. Without my amendment, it could only be read as an attack on Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits.

The programs my amendment specifies helps veterans receive healthcare, aid struggling families who have fallen on hard times, and support millions of Americans by ensuring they receive the benefits they have spent their life working and paying for.

Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and efforts to end veteran homelessness are programs every Member of this body should be proud to support. But instead, my colleagues on the other side have spent years attempting to undermine and dismantle them, and they are doing it again with this so-called resolution. This so-called anti-socialism resolution is simply the latest volley in an assault that goes back decades.

Despite these attacks, the programs my amendment defends are overwhelmingly supported by the American people. Americans know that these policies work. They are practical. They are beyond ideology. They are simply common sense. The people want us to join together to bolster and expand them, not to denigrate and defund them and play stupid games to distract and propose red herring amendments such as this to get us off the track of working for the American people.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all know why we are here today. We are here to condemn socialism. Let's not play games. We know what socialism is.

Despite knowing what socialism and communism is, you are going to see Democrat after Democrat come down here on the floor and refuse to vote to condemn socialism and communism.

Let's talk about what that means. Mao Zedong, in the socialist revolution in China, you had 55 million people starve to death in the wake of famine and devastation caused by the so-called Great Leap Forward in China.

You are going to have Democrats come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

Let's talk about Joseph Stalin. By the way, a history lesson: FDR, a Democrat, would refer to Joseph Stalin as "Uncle Joe" when he was trying to make this ruthless thug more palatable to the American people.

Again, a Democrat praising Joseph Stalin; but I digress.

Under Stalin, tens of millions died in the Bolshevik revolution.

At least 10 million people were sent to the Gulags in the USSR; and millions starved to death in Ukraine due to forced famine. Pol Pot eliminated one-fourth of the population in Cambodia.

Again, you are going to have Democrats come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

Due to socialist and totalitarian policies, over 75 percent of Venezuelans currently live in poverty. Only 3 percent of Venezuelans consider themselves food secure. This was the largest GDP in South America before Chavez took over, and now they are literally eating their pet dogs to stop starvation.

Marxist socialist policies and communism regimes are responsible for hundreds of millions of deaths worldwide. Again, my Democratic colleagues

will come to this floor later today and refuse to condemn it. It is truly astounding.

Mr. Speaker, 3.5 million have starved to death in North Korea just since the 1990s alone. In the current Communist regime in Cuba, the government continues to repress and punish virtually all forms of dissent and public criticism as Cubans endure the worst economic crisis seen in decades.

Again, Democrats will come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

During Castro's rule, thousands of Cubans have been incarcerated in abysmal prisons; thousands more were harassed and intimidated; and entire generations were denied basic freedoms.

Again, my Democratic colleagues, some of them will refuse to condemn that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD), my good friend.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of confusion today, a lot of bewilderment, a lot of dismay from my friends on the other side of the aisle on exactly why we are here today.

I am here to tell you it is a shame we have to be here today, that we have to publicly put everyone on record to denounce socialism. I rise today in somber support of this resolution, a resolution to denounce the evils, the horrors of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, this is a somber issue because our Nation was founded on the principles of liberty and freedom, enshrined in our founding documents as the thesis of our very Nation.

However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here have made light of the horrors of socialism and at times have advocated for this radical ideology to the point that the youth of our Nation have been deceived.

□ 1300

They have begun falling away from the true ideals of the freedoms on which our Nation was founded, that being liberty and democracy.

Let me clear up some of this confusion for our good friends: This cannot happen. We can never let it happen again.

Socialism has created famine, mass murders, and the killing of over 100 million humans around the world.

Many of the worst crimes in history were committed by socialist ideologues: Stalin, Mao Zedong, Castro, Kim Jong-un, and Maduro.

Yes, I am here today to tell you that we also condemn categorically any form of socialism, including Vladimir Putin.

This history cannot be forgotten, as socialist regimes have indefinitely led to the destruction of personal liberties and are still a constant threat.

Future generations must be taught. They must understand the horrors of socialism.

So, we stand here today. It is a shame we have to be here to do this, to

teach this lesson, to denounce the horrors of socialism, and to protect the freedoms of our great Nation and take a stand for personal liberty.

Our young people have been led astray. Our Nation has been blinded to some degree, and it is time to lift the scales off those blind eyes. It is time that every American take a stand.

It is time to tell the truth. The truth is the only thing that matters, and the truth is that socialism is evil.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a strange debate. I am glad the gentleman said that he personally condemns Vladimir Putin, but it still doesn't explain why Putin is not on this list.

I mean, if everybody condemns Vladimir Putin, then why isn't he on this list? There are other communists on this list. If we are going to condemn communism, fine, but communism isn't mentioned in this resolution.

People were talking about supporting capitalism, and capitalism isn't even mentioned in this resolution.

This is a stupid resolution that was written poorly to begin with.

Again, I would say to my colleagues that we gave you an opportunity to expand the list to include the National Socialist German Workers' Party, which is the Nazis, who are responsible for the killing of 6 million Jews, and everybody voted "no" on the Republican side. I just can't get my head around why that was such a controversial addition.

This is an interesting back and forth on history. By the way, when I go home, people are not bringing up Stalin and Lenin and Pol Pot all the time. They are bringing up Putin, and they are concerned about what he is doing in Ukraine.

Maybe the reason Putin is not on this list is because the other side of the aisle is divided in their support to help protect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people. Maybe that is what we are going to see coming down the road, in terms of budget cuts.

I include in the RECORD a piece by Roll Call titled: "House GOP overlooks internal anti-Semitism, points at Democrats."

[From Roll Call, Dec. 1, 2022]

HOUSE GOP OVERLOOKS INTERNAL
ANTISEMITISM, POINTS AT DEMOCRATS
(By Rachel Oswald)

House Republican leaders on Capitol Hill are declining to condemn and punish antisemitism within their own party, preferring instead to argue that Democrats have the prejudice problem.

This comes amid the rise and mainstreaming of antisemitic rhetoric in the United States in recent months, including by major entertainers and top athletes, not to mention a sharp uptick in the last year of assaults on American Jews. Hate speech, threats and violence against American Jews are at their highest documented level in decades.

The issue came into focus in the last week after former President Donald Trump welcomed to his Mar-a-Lago club in Florida for

dinner the well-known white power leader and antisemite Nicholas Fuentes, an organizer and speaker at many "Stop the Steal" protests after the 2020 presidential election.

"Anyone who engages in antisemitic tropes or makes antisemitic remarks should face the consequences of his or her actions. It's not enough to just call out someone on the other side of the aisle when it meets your political aims," Jonathan Greenblatt, CEO of the Anti-Defamation League, said in a statement. "Frankly, what we need to see more of, is leaders of both parties standing up to antisemitism within their own ranks."

Some Republican leaders like Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky denounced Trump's dinner with Fuentes while others, such as House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy of California, offered milder criticism.

"I don't think anybody should be spending any time with Nick Fuentes. He has no place in this Republican Party," said McCarthy to reporters outside the White House on Tuesday. He went on to defend Trump, claiming the former president was ignorant of Fuentes' well-known racist and antisemitic views when he had him over for dinner.

At the same breaking-bread affair, Trump also hosted the hip-hop superstar Kanye West, who now goes by Ye and drew national scorn in recent weeks for verbal attacks on Jews on social media.

"I condemn his [Fuentes'] ideology. It has no place in society at all," said McCarthy, who is struggling to lock down the votes he needs from his caucus to become the next House speaker in January. Like other Republicans, McCarthy has stopped short of directly saying Trump has supported antisemitism with his actions.

In part to boost support for his candidacy with the conservative House Freedom Caucus, McCarthy has promised if he becomes speaker he will hold a House floor vote to remove Rep. Ilhan Omar, D-Minn., from the Foreign Affairs Committee. As a freshman lawmaker in 2019, Omar was roundly criticized for comments that elevated common antisemitic tropes about dual loyalty and Jewish influence over American politics.

Notably, however, House Democratic leaders led the criticism of Omar and she apologized. Though there have been other moments of tension in the ensuing years between Omar and the House's Jewish Democrats over her criticism of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, she hasn't repeated the antisemitic tropes she made in early 2019.

The expected next chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Michael McCaul, said he would likely support Omar's removal from the panel.

"The Foreign Affairs Committee has always been very pro-Israel, pro-Jewish, and I don't think she's a perfect fit," the Texas Republican said on Tuesday.

Omar in a statement rebuked McCarthy and House Republican leaders.

"Whether it is Marjorie Taylor Greene holding a gun next to my head in campaign ads or Donald Trump threatening to 'send me back' to my country . . . this constant stream of hate has led to hundreds of death threats and credible plots against me and my family," she said of Taylor Greene.

"Instead of doing anything to address the open hostility towards religious minorities in his party, McCarthy is now lifting up people like Marjorie Taylor Greene, Emmer and so many others," Omar said. "If he cared about addressing the rise in hate, he would apologize and make sure others in his party apologized."

In contrast to Omar, some House Republicans haven't apologized, repeating antisemitic conspiracy theories and amplifying Holocaust deniers—including in the last year.

'KEEPING THAT PROMISE'

McCarthy indicated he sees removing Omar from the panel as fair play for the treatment Taylor Greene and Gosar received from House Democrats. . . .

"Last year, I promised that when I became Speaker, I would remove Rep. Ilhan Omar from the House Foreign Affairs Committee based on her repeated antisemitic and anti-American remarks. I'm keeping that promise," McCarthy said in a Nov. 19 Twitter post.

Gosar was also removed from his committee assignments a little over a year ago as punishment for circulating an animated video depicting him killing Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y. . . .

Though he reportedly privately reprimanded Gosar for publicizing the video, McCarthy didn't support taking away his committee assignments, nor did the rest of the GOP House caucus save for two members.

Rep. Tom Emmer, R-Minn., who earlier this month won a contested caucus election for the position of majority whip in the next Congress, made a similar reference in a letter he sent as National Republican Congressional Committee chairman that accused Bloomberg, Soros and Steyer of having "bought" control of Congress for Democrats.

"One of the most popular unfortunately antisemitic tropes is the idea that Jews are pulling the strings," said Rabbi Jill Jacobs, the executive director of T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights.

"People aren't expected to know everything about antisemitism, but when something gets called out the right response is, 'Thank you for letting me know. I didn't know that. I won't do that again.' We have not seen that from McCarthy and others. We have just seen deflecting and rejecting," she added.

And Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-N.Y., the No. 3 House Republican, this year ran a series of Facebook ads through her campaign committee that accused Democrats of supporting citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants in order to "overthrow our current electorate and create a permanent liberal majority."

HATE AND VIOLENCE

That phrasing echoes the "great replacement theory," a far-right idea that is itself rooted in antisemitic tropes.

"When you look at white nationalist online chatter, it's very much all about this supposed Jewish plot. We saw it in the person who murdered Jews in a synagogue in Pittsburgh," said Jacobs, referring to the 2018 antisemitic terrorist attack at the Tree of Life synagogue that killed 11 people. "His rationale was that Jews were bringing in refugees to destroy America."

Antisemitism has been rising among both the far right and the far left, although experts said it is the far right that is statistically more likely to commit violent acts against Jews.

Last year, the Anti-Defamation League, which tracks and condemns antisemitism, documented 2,717 antisemitic incidents in the United States, a 34 percent increase over the prior year and the highest number recorded since the organization began its monitoring work in 1979. That figure included 88 incidents of violent assault, a 167 percent increase from 2020.

In New York City last month, police arrested two young men, one of whom said he ran a white supremacist Twitter group and had been posting threats to imminently shoot up a synagogue. According to news reports, the duo appeared to have recently been gathering weapons and ammunition for the thwarted terrorist attack.

Democrats and progressives are still divided over how to calibrate criticism from their side of the aisle about the Israeli government's human rights abuses of the Palestinians without crossing the line into antisemitic tropes.

"To fight antisemitism, you really need people from across the political spectrum. If you look at the violence against Jews in the last three or four years, it mostly comes from the extreme right. But if you know anything about antisemitism you know that it could someday come from other parts of society," said Ira Forman, a former special envoy to monitor and combat antisemitism in the Obama administration. "Democrats should be calling out Democrats and liberals and Republicans ought to be calling out conservatives."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Republican leaders have repeatedly declined to condemn and punish antisemitism, hate, and violence pushed by Members within their own party.

Again, I don't care how people voted. This is a meaningless, ridiculous waste of time, but my particular concern with this resolution is not all the whereas clauses. It is the resolved clause.

Many of us are concerned because of the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle because so many of you have referred to Medicare as a socialist program and Social Security as a socialist program.

We asked you last night simply to reassure us, and we had an amendment. You heard the amendment—Mr. TAKANO spoke about it—that none of this has anything to do with Social Security and Medicare. Guess what, everybody? They all voted "no."

That is what our concern is about, and people can say whatever they want on this. I mean, I can't believe, with all that is going on in the world, we are spending a day talking about this, but whatever.

This is the new Republican list of priorities, and there is no wonder why a poll just came out showing that the majority of American people do not share the views, values, and priorities of this current Republican House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear that people in Massachusetts are not talking about communism. Do you know where they are talking about communism? Places like south Florida. Places like Miami.

It is because, unlike those in Massachusetts, they have experienced communism. They have experienced socialism. Ask any Cuban refugee.

That is why you have individuals here like MARIO DIAZ-BALART, like MARIA SALAZAR, like CARLOS GIMENEZ who represent those districts.

This is an issue for a lot of Americans because they never want to see the horrors of socialism and communism here on our shores.

It is not just Cuba. Let's talk about China because my friends across the

aisle always hesitate to criticize and condemn China. It is quite remarkable.

China has deprived 1.4 billion human beings of their fundamental human rights. Since March 2017, China has detained and persecuted 1.8 million Turkic Muslims, the Uyghurs.

They put them in so-called political reeducation camps. We all know what those are. Those are death camps. Those are gulags. The Chinese have them in their western province. The world is silent on it, and my colleagues from across the aisle refuse to condemn socialism.

Those Uyghurs are being held in the western province without due process. They are being forced to engage in labor and forced organ harvesting. They are suffering atrocities like torture, and yet again, my Democrat colleagues will refuse to condemn socialism today.

The CCP hasn't just violated the rights of the Uyghurs in western China. They have also subjugated Tibet.

It used to be a cause celebre for my friends across the aisle to talk about freeing Tibet. When I was growing up in the 1990s, you saw the bumper stickers everywhere. Where is that outrage now from my Democratic colleagues? Why won't they call out China?

In Tibet, the CCP has engaged in severe repression of the Tibetans' unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage and is engaged in gross human rights violations in Tibet, including but not limited to extrajudicial detentions, disappearances, and torture.

Elsewhere, the CCP is widely alleged to be a major harvester and trafficker of forcibly acquired organs. Organ harvesting targets minorities, including the Falun Gong, Uyghurs, Tibetan Muslims, and Christians in China.

Yet, where is the outrage from my friends across the aisle? Why won't they condemn socialism here today on the House floor?

The CCP attempts to eliminate minority peoples through forced abortion and sterilization. Where is the outrage from across the aisle?

There are 30 million more men in China than women due to forced abortions and the one-child policy, the result of Big Government socialism. Yet, again, my friends across the aisle will refuse to condemn socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK), my good friend and a good doctor.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why there is some confusion. I understand why we can get distracted by foreign nations and communism, which most of us agree is a bad thing.

What I think is enlightening, though, is how we opened. What was stated, in my understanding or recollection, was that it was just said that the last Democratic-controlled Congress was the most effective and productive in recent history, which you just agreed to.

The standard that the statement was made and measured by, though, shows

why we are having this discussion, why my Democratic colleagues are confused.

They equate record spending, record debt, and unprecedented control by government over private business as success. That is why they are confused about what this bill is about and why it is germane.

They do not understand what socialism is or, worse, don't recognize that their policies are in direct support of socialist leanings. Their policies have continuously placed government in a position to control businesses, picking winners and losers, deciding what is moral and immoral, and continue to advance the idea that government somehow should have been empowered to solve the very problems that it created.

To clear up things and create less confusion, we are trying to counter a movement that is moving toward something we have never been, a socialist nation.

We are a unique government created by the people, for the people, empowered to protect, not to provide for, and not to determine the outcome of people's endeavors.

We are uniquely positioned to benefit our citizens by empowering them, not through more government. I believe that we the people are far more valuable than we the government. That is why we speak against bigger government and socialism.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To the gentleman who just spoke, who talked about record debt, yes, we worry about that, as well. I would remind him that 25 percent of this Nation's debt was accumulated in the 4 years of Donald Trump.

Let me repeat that: A quarter of our Nation's debt in all of our history was accumulated in the 4 years of Donald Trump.

If increasing debt is the standard where you say a President failed, then there is no question that the previous President, Mr. Trump, was a miserable failure.

Let me say to my colleague from Pennsylvania who brought up China—again, I am having trouble following this debate. I will not be lectured by anybody on commitment to human rights in China. I co-chaired the Congressional-Executive Commission on China. I co-chair the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

I authored the bill, the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, by the way, which died in a Republican Senate. We managed to get it passed in a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate.

I have passed major legislation on behalf of the Tibetan people.

By the way, this is all happening now under President Xi of China. I am looking in this resolution, and there is no mention of President Xi.

We are debating issues that aren't even in this resolution. I mean, this is nuts.

I do want to get back to the other bill, the bill that my colleagues are bringing to take Representative ILHAN OMAR off the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I read in some of the publications that, to get votes, the Republican leaders apparently promised some of their Republican Members who were concerned about this process that there would be some due process put in place.

I include in the RECORD the statement released yesterday by Representative SPARTZ about what supposedly is in this resolution.

[Press Release, Jan. 31, 2023]

SPARTZ ISSUES STATEMENT ON OMAR: I WILL SUPPORT RESOLUTION WITH EQUAL TREATMENT UNDER RULES AND DUE PROCESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today, Rep. Spartz issued the statement below on the resolution to remove Rep. Omar from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

"I appreciate Speaker McCarthy's willingness to address legitimate concerns and add due process language to our resolution. Deliberation and debate are vital for our institution, not top-down approaches," Spartz said. "The rule of law, freedom of speech, and due process are fundamental to our Constitutional Republic. Our founding fathers understood that pure democracy is dangerous and can lead to the tyranny of majority, mob rule and dictatorship. As to my fellow conservatives, I think setting a precedent of allowing an appeal process for the Speaker's and majority-party removal decisions is particularly important to freedom-loving legislators who usually are on the receiving end of issues like this."

Mr. MCGOVERN. The statement touts due process language that was supposedly added to the resolution. I have to admit, I am completely lost here.

There is nothing—let me repeat that, nothing; one more time, nothing—in this resolution that provides due process.

Don't take my word for it. I have a nice quote here for people to follow along with me. There is a quote in Politico today: "The whereas clause added merely references an existing process and in no way begins an appeal procedure or guarantees her committee seat will be reconsidered. It is non-binding and not actionable."

That is according to a senior GOP aide in a comment that they made to Politico. To whoever that senior GOP aide is, let me just say thank you for your candor. I think it is appreciated.

To people like the gentlewoman from Indiana and others who somehow think that they negotiated some sort of due process here, you didn't get anything. If you think you did, then you are a cheap date.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reiterate the long list of reasons that these resolutions are a waste of time. Quite

frankly, they are an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Let me be clear: The socialism resolution is useless. It does nothing. It does not matter. Who the hell cares how anybody votes on it?

We are here for one reason, and we are here for one reason only. My Republican colleagues are pushing an extreme far-right agenda that benefits the rich and powerful and screws over working families and everyone else.

They are not paying attention to the problems of everyday people, and that is clear based on the recent polling that has come out that shows just how out of touch they are with where people are at all around this country.

They are not paying attention to the kitchen table issues that people anguish over every night. I can assure you, and I don't care what part of the country you come from, people aren't sitting around the table talking about Pol Pot.

Anyway, that is what my Republican friends think is a national priority. I mean, we are talking about socialism in this resolution, but we are not talking about a definition or what it is. Are we talking about public schools? Are we talking about roads? Are we talking about Social Security?

I mean, give me a break. We have been hearing this stuff for decades and decades, Republicans saying Democrats want socialism. It is always some big, scary takeover that is just over the horizon that everyone needs to be afraid of.

□ 1315

When you don't have any good issues on your side and fear is all you have, that is what you run with, I guess. That is the Republican playbook.

You know what is funny is that the same Republicans who decry anything that government does as socialism never seem to have a problem when it comes to huge handouts for billionaire corporations. They want socialism for the rich but capitalism for the poor.

Call me crazy, but here is what I think: This resolution is not about socialism. It is about scaring people. It is about dividing people and, quite frankly, I think, based on what happened in the Rules Committee last night, it is about setting the stage to go after the social safety net in this country, which includes Social Security and Medicare.

If that wasn't the case, why in the world would my Republican friends not allow a clarifying amendment to make it clear that that was not the intent? They all voted "no."

When it comes to Congresswoman OMAR, a good Congresswoman who fights hard for her district and for her values, this isn't about punishing her for anything she said. It is about scoring political points.

If this was about condemning anti-Semitism, Republicans would be condemning the folks on your side who dine with Holocaust deniers and appear at white supremacy rallies.

If this was about condemning anti-Semitism, Republicans would have accepted our amendment to condemn the Nazis who slaughtered 6 million Jews during World War II; and every one of them voted “no.”

So please spare us the false equivalence. This is total BS, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

This is, really, a sad day for this Chamber. With all that needs to be done, with all that needs to be done, this is the priority. This is the priority, and, I should add for good measure, all of this is being brought to you under closed rules.

All the amendments that were offered, all the suggestions that were brought on this and other bills by Democrats and Republicans, were all ruled out of order. Some of this is non-controversial stuff, all closed.

The issue with Congresswoman OMAR was brought to the Rules Committee as an emergency. An emergency? Really? I don't get it.

You shouldn't be surprised because the last time the Republicans were in charge they brought a bill to the floor as an emergency to deal with cheese curd, so I get it. Everything is an emergency, especially when it comes to messaging and making political statements.

But look, we have to get back to the people's business, Mr. Speaker. We have to get back to focusing on kitchen-table issues, the stuff that people worry about every night. This is not it. This is not it.

I really regret that we are wasting this time on these poorly crafted bills that do nothing to help anybody in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just in the spirit of rebuttal, I would like to address some of the comments made by my friend across the aisle.

The spending under President Trump; there was spending under President Trump.

But you know what? He also had a pandemic, a pandemic that we haven't seen in the last 100 years.

So where is the excuse for the \$1.7 trillion that was just rammed through?

You want to talk about closed rules, things not going through regular order?

That \$1.7 trillion was rammed through. It was architected—didn't even go through the Senate Appropriations Committee. It was rammed through by two Senators that are no longer here who had zero accountability to the American public.

What about Build Back Better? Where is the excuse for that?

All Build Back Better did was increase inflation, hurt workers who have wages that aren't keeping pace with inflation.

What about the Inflation Reduction Act? Where is the excuse for that and why we had rampant spending there?

There is no excuse for it.

Let's talk about China. To paraphrase Marcus Aurelius, it is not about one's words; it is about their deeds.

Let's talk about the deeds of my friends across the aisle. Three years ago or so, my good friend, the Speaker of the House, put together—he wanted to put together a select committee on China, and he was strung along by my friends across the aisle.

Finally, the Speaker had to move forward on his own as the minority Republican leader to put together the China Task Force. I was privileged to be on the China Task Force. You know how many Democrats were on that task force? Exactly zero. Zero Democrats joined that task force.

So it is quite amazing how I hear that the Democrats want to condemn China; but when they had the chance to have a select committee to address the threat of China, they won't go along with. When they had the chance to join a task force explicitly put together to combat China and their malign influences on the world, zero of them joined that task force. So spare me the talk on China. We have seen how you treated China.

Let's talk about definitions; playing these silly games that we can't define “socialism” and “communism.” We are all educated. We all know what socialism is. We all know what communism is. So spare me the fact that “socialism” isn't defined in this bill.

This is especially rich from the party, my friends across the aisle who, for the last 2 years, couldn't even define basic terms like what is a woman. That is not just me saying that.

Let's talk about Justice Brown Jackson. She was asked during confirmation to define a woman; and you know what her response was? “No, I can't.”

So the party that can't define a woman now wants to sit here and say that we can't define “socialism” and “communism.” We all know what this is.

Let's talk about, lastly, Representative ILHAN OMAR and due process. I know there was a display put up regarding due process.

It is quite amazing how my friends across the aisle have now discovered the principle of due process after 4 years—I'm sorry—2 years of one-party rule here in Washington, D.C., 2 years where due process wasn't followed at all.

Where was the due process for my good friend from Georgia when she was removed from all her committees? Again, that is all her committees. We are only removing Representative ILHAN OMAR from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Where was the due process for my good friend, Dr. Gosar, when he was removed, again, from all his committees?

There wasn't one Democrat who stood up and talked about due process. But miraculously, now we have found due process when the Republicans are removing somebody from a committee,

one committee, for anti-Semitic remarks, and a pattern of anti-Semitic remarks for that.

But let's just go back and talk about socialism. Let me be clear. Socialism must never take root in America. President Trump himself said America will never be a socialist Nation. These are words we should all rally around. We should all support that.

But for too long, Democrats have fought this far-left authoritarian agenda, regardless of the regimes across the globe that commit acts of violence and oppression against their own people in its name.

Experiments with socialism have led to painful human tragedy. We are talking about starvation, imprisonment, imprisonment without due process, I might add, and mass murder.

Capitalism has lifted more people out of poverty than any other system. It is capitalism that is the way out of poverty, not socialism, not communism.

Two hundred years ago, at the birth of capitalism, there were only about 600 million people in the world who were not living in extreme poverty. Today, due to the advance of capitalism, there are more than 6.5 billion people who are not living in extreme poverty. It was free-market capitalism that led the way here, not government-controlled socialism.

Since 1970, the percentage of the world's population living on the equivalent of less than \$1 a day has fallen by more than 80 percent. Instead of millions starving to death due to socialism and communism, capitalism has pulled hundreds of millions of people out of despair.

Socialism and anti-Semitism have absolutely no place in America.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 83

Strike the first section after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows: “Page 3, line 4, add at the end the following:

“For purposes of the previous sentence, the term ‘socialism’ does not include existing

Federal programs and policies such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.”.”

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 83; and

Adoption of House Resolution 83, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 9, DENOUNCING THE HORRORS OF SOCIALISM AND H. RES. 76, REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 207, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller (WV)
Alford	Garbarino	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Garcia, Mike	Mills
Amodei	Gimenez	Molinaro
Armstrong	Gonzales, Tony	Moolenaar
Arrington	Good (VA)	Mooney
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Baird	Granger	Moran
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Banks	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Barr	Green (TN)	Newhouse
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bentz	Griffith	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Grothman	Obernolte
Bice	Guest	Ogles
Biggs	Guthrie	Owens
Bilirakis	Hageman	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perry
Boebert	Harshbarger	Pfuger
Bost	Hern	Posey
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Hudson	Rose
Burgess	Huizenga	Rosendale
Burlison	Hunt	Rouzer
Calvert	Issa	Roy
Cammack	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carl	James	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Santos
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kiley	Smucker
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Staubert
Curtis	LaHood	Steel
D'Esposito	LaLota	Stefanik
Davidson	LaMalfa	Steil
De La Cruz	Lamborn	Stewart
DesJarlais	Langworthy	Latta
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Strong
Donalds	LaTurner	Tenney
Duarte	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Timmons
Edwards	Letlow	Turner
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Valadao
Emmer	Lucas	Van Drew
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Van Dune
Ezell	Luna	Van Orden
Fallon	Luttrell	Wagner
Feenstra	Mace	Walberg
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Waltz
Finstad	Mann	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	Massie	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	Mast	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Westerman
Fleischmann	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Flood	McClain	Williams (TX)
Fox	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Franklin, C.	McCormick	Wittman
Scott	McHenry	Womack
Fry	Meuser	Yakym
Fulcher	Miller (IL)	Zinke
Gaetz	Miller (OH)	

NAYS—207

Adams	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Aguilar	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Alfred	Bonamici	Carson
Auchincloss	Bowman	Carter (LA)
Balint	Boyle (PA)	Cartwright
Barragán	Brown	Casas
Beatty	Brownley	Case
Bera	Budzinski	Casten
Beyer	Bush	Castor (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Caraveo	Castro (TX)

Cerfilus-	Jacobs	Pingree
McCormick	Jayapal	Pocan
Chu	Jeffries	Porter
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clark (MA)	Kamlager-Dove	Ramirez
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Raskin
Cleaver	Keating	Ross
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Connolly	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Correa	Kildee	Ryan
Costa	Kilmer	Salinas
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Sánchez
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Crockett	Kuster	Scanlon
Crow	Landsman	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Scholten
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Scott, David
DeLauro	Levin	Sewell
DelBene	Lieu	Sherman
Deluzio	Lofgren	Sherrill
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Slotkin
Dingell	Magaziner	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Manning	Sorensen
Escobar	Matsui	Soto
Eshoo	McBath	Spanberger
Espallat	McCollum	Stansbury
Evans	McGarvey	Stanton
Fletcher	McGovern	Stevens
Foster	Meeks	Strickland
Foushee	Menendez	Swalwell
Frankel, Lois	Meng	Sykes
Frost	Mfume	Takano
Gallego	Moore (WI)	Thamendar
Garamendi	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Garcia (TX)	Moskowitz	Thompson (MS)
Garcia, Robert	Moulton	Titus
Golden (ME)	Mrvan	Tlaib
Goldman (NY)	Mullin	Tokuda
Gomez	Nadler	Tonko
Gonzalez,	Napolitano	Torres (CA)
Vicente	Neal	Torres (NY)
Gottheimer	Neguse	Trahan
Green, Al (TX)	Nickel	Trone
Grijalva	Norcross	Underwood
Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Hayes	Omar	Vasquez
Higgins (NY)	Pallone	Veasey
Himes	Panetta	Velázquez
Horsford	Pappas	Wasserman
Houlahan	Pascarella	Schultz
Hoyer	Payne	Waters
Hoyle (OR)	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Huffman	Peltola	Wexton
Ivey	Perez	Wild
Jackson (IL)	Peters	Williams (GA)
Jackson (NC)	Phillips	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Carey	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Cohen	Pence	Steube
Garcia (IL)	Petterson	

□ 1355

Mses. CRAIG, JAYAPAL, Messrs. PETERS, LARSON of Connecticut, and CORREA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FRY, CRAWFORD, and CALVERT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 209, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—218

Aderholt	Gaetz	Miller (OH)
Alford	Gallagher	Miller (WV)
Allen	Garbarino	Miller-Meeks
Amodei	Garcia, Mike	Mills
Armstrong	Jimenez	Molinaro
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Moolenaar
Babin	Good (VA)	Mooney
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Baird	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Granger	Moran
Banks	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Barr	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Newhouse
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bergman	Griffith	Nunn (IA)
Bice	Grothman	Oberholte
Biggs	Guest	Ogles
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Owens
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Palmer
Boebert	Harris	Perry
Bost	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Brecheen	Hern	Posey
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Buck	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hudson	Rose
Burlison	Huizenga	Rosendale
Calvert	Hunt	Rouzer
Cammack	Issa	Roy
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carl	James	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Santos
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Scallise
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kiley	Smucker
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Stauber
Curtis	LaHood	Steel
D'Esposito	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Davidson	Lamborn	Steil
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Stewart
DesJarlais	Latta	Strong
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Tenney
Donalds	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
Duarte	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Duncan	Lesko	Timmons
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Turner
Edwards	Loudermilk	Valadao
Ellzey	Lucas	Van Drew
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Duyn
Estes	Luna	Van Orden
Ezell	Luttrell	Wagner
Fallon	Mace	Walberg
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Waltz
Ferguson	Mann	Weber (TX)
Finstad	Massie	Webster (FL)
Fischbach	Mast	Wenstrup
Fitzgerald	McCarthy	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	McCaull	Williams (NY)
Fleischmann	McClain	Williams (TX)
Flood	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fox	McCormick	Wittman
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Womack
Scott	Meuser	Yakym
Fry	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NOES—209

Adams	Cárdenas	Craig
Aguilar	Carson	Crockett
Allred	Carter (LA)	Crow
Auchincloss	Cartwright	Cuellar
Balint	Casar	Davids (KS)
Barragán	Case	Davis (IL)
Beatty	Casten	Davis (NC)
Bera	Castro (FL)	Dean (PA)
Beyer	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Cherfilus-	DeLauro
Blumenauer	McCormick	DeBene
Blunt Rochester	Chu	Deluzio
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bowman	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Boyle (PA)	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Brown	Cleaver	Escobar
Brownley	Clyburn	Eshoo
Budzinski	Connolly	Españillat
Bush	Correa	Evans
Caraveo	Costa	Fletcher
Carbajal	Courtney	Foster

Foushee	Lofgren	Sánchez
Frankel, Lois	Lynch	Sarbanes
Frost	Magaziner	Scanlon
Gallego	Manning	Schakowsky
Garamendi	Matsui	Schiff
Garcia (TX)	McBath	Schneider
Garcia, Robert	McCollum	Scholten
Golden (ME)	McGarvey	Schrier
Goldman (NY)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Gomez	Meeks	Scott, David
Gonzalez,	Menendez	Sewell
Vicente	Meng	Sherman
Gottheimer	Mfume	Sherrill
Moran	Moore (WI)	Slotkin
Murphy	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Nehls	Moskowitz	Sorensen
Harder (CA)	Moulton	Soto
Hayes	Mrvan	Spanberger
Higgins (NY)	Mullin	Stansbury
Himes	Nadler	Stanton
Horsford	Napolitano	Stevens
Houlihan	Neal	Strickland
Hoyer	Neguse	Swalwell
Hoyle (OR)	Nickel	Sykes
Huffman	Norcross	Takano
Ivey	Ocasio-Cortez	Thanedar
Jackson (IL)	Omar	Thompson (CA)
Jackson (NC)	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Jacobs	Panetta	Titus
Jayapal	Pappas	Tlaib
Jeffries	Pascrell	Tokuda
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Tonko
Kamlager-Dove	Pelosi	Torres (CA)
Kaptur	Peltola	Torres (NY)
Keating	Perez	Trahan
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Trone
Khanna	Pettersen	Underwood
Kildee	Phillips	Vargas
Kilmer	Pingree	Vasquez
Kim (NJ)	Pocan	Veasey
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Velázquez
Kuster	Pressley	Wasserman
Landsman	Quigley	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Ramirez	Waters
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Watson Coleman
Lee (CA)	Ross	Wexton
Lee (NV)	Ruiz	Wild
Lee (PA)	Ruppersberger	Williams (GA)
Leger Fernandez	Ryan	Wilson (FL)
Levin	Salinas	
Lieu		

NOT VOTING—7

Cohen	Jackson Lee	Steube
Fulcher	LaLota	
Garcia (IL)	Pence	

□ 1403

Mr. GALLEGO changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOPPING HOME OFFICE WORK'S UNPRODUCTIVE PROBLEMS ACT OF 2023

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 75, I call up the bill (H.R. 139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID-19 pandemic and a plan for the agency's future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF). Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act of 2023” or the “SHOW UP Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. REINSTATEMENT OF PRE-PANDEMIC TELEWORK POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND LEVELS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency shall reinstate and apply the telework policies, practices, and levels of the agency as in effect on December 31, 2019, and may not expand any such policy, practices, or levels until the date that an agency plan is submitted to Congress with a certification by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 3.

SEC. 3. STUDY, PLAN, AND CERTIFICATION REGARDING EXECUTIVE AGENCY TELEWORK POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND LEVELS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency, in consultation with the Director, shall submit to Congress—

(1) a study on the impacts on the agency and its mission of expanding telework by its employees during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic that commenced in 2019, including an analysis of—

(A) any adverse impacts of that expansion on the agency's performance of its mission, including the performance of customer service by the agency;

(B) any costs to the agency during that expansion attributable to—

(i) owning, leasing, or maintaining underutilized real property; or

(ii) paying higher rates of locality pay to teleworking employees as a result of incorrectly classifying such employees as teleworkers rather than remote workers;

(C) any degree to which the agency failed during that expansion to provide teleworking employees with secure network capacity, communications tools, necessary and secure access to appropriate agency data assets and Federal records, and equipment sufficient to enable each such employee to be fully productive;

(D) any degree to which that expansion facilitated dispersal of the agency workforce around the Nation; and

(E) any other impacts of that expansion that the agency or the Director considers appropriate;

(2) any agency plan to expand telework policies, practices, or levels beyond those in place as a result of section 2; and

(3) a certification by the Director that such plan will—

(A) have a substantial positive effect on—

(i) the performance of the agency's mission, including the performance of customer service;

(ii) increasing the level of dispersal of agency personnel throughout the Nation; and

(iii) the reversal of any adverse impact set forth pursuant to paragraph (1)(D);

(B) substantially lower the agency's costs of owning, leasing, or maintaining real property;

(C) substantially lower the agency's costs attributable to paying locality pay to agency personnel working from locations outside the pay locality of their position's official worksite; and

(D) ensure that teleworking employees will be provided with secure network capacity, communications tools, necessary and secure access to appropriate agency data assets and Federal records, and equipment sufficient to enable each such employee to be fully productive, without substantially increasing the

agency's overall costs for secure network capacity, communications tools, and equipment.

(b) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An agency may not implement the plan submitted under subsection (a)(2) unless a certification by the Director was issued under subsection (a)(3).

(2) SUBSEQUENT PLANS.—In the event an initial agency plan submitted under subsection (a)(2) fails to receive such certification, the agency may submit to the Director subsequent plans until such certification is received, and submit such plan and certification to Congress.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term “Executive agency” in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(3) the term “locality pay” means locality pay provided for under section 5304 or 5304a of such title; and

(4) the terms “telework” and “teleworking” have the meaning given those terms in section 6501 of such title, and include remote work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 139, the Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act, or the SHOW UP Act.

This legislation is urgent. The Federal workforce needs to get back to work. Federal agencies are falling short of their missions. They are not carrying out their duties. They are failing the American people.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, most of the Federal workforce stayed home. They relied on telework because they could, but as the rest of America went back to work in person, many Federal workers did not.

The American people have suffered as a result. They have waited for months for their tax refunds from the IRS. They have waited for months for the Social Security Administration to answer their questions and provide them benefits.

Our veterans have even waited for months to get their medical records from the National Archives. The National Archives is responsible for maintaining medical records for our vet-

erans, but our veterans could not get access to these records because the National Archives staff were at home.

This is unacceptable, and it should be downright embarrassing to these agencies.

The American people have struggled with high inflation, scarce goods, prolonged and disruptive lockdowns, and other hardships. Meanwhile, the Biden administration has showered Federal workers with perks and pay increases all while working from home, but Federal employees not being in the workplace hurt the Federal Government's ability to achieve its missions and deliver vital programs.

House Republicans have fought hard to find out just how expanded telework has decreased agencies' ability to deliver services to our constituents. We have tried to get this information from the Biden administration, but to no avail.

During the last Congress, as the House Oversight and Reform Committee ranking member, I wrote to the administration, requesting information on Federal workforce return-to-work policies. The Biden administration failed to provide adequate responses to our inquiries. Instead, it kept expanded telework policies in place long after the pandemic was over, and it used its expanded telework policies not to help our constituents but to help recruit new employees to the Federal Government.

The Federal workforce already enjoys many perks not enjoyed by the private sector, including unparalleled job stability, healthy retirement benefits, and reliable pay-growth expectations. One would have thought that, as the pandemic wound down, Federal workers would have returned to their offices just as private-sector workers across the Nation did. That is not the case.

According to the Office of Personnel Management's most recent report on telework, 47 percent of Federal workers teleworked routinely or situationally in fiscal year 2021. That was a 2 percent increase over fiscal year 2020, the year in which the pandemic struck.

According to a Federal Times report this past October, just one in three Federal workers had returned to their office full time in 2022.

Just last week, The Wall Street Journal reported that a new study by Cushman & Wakefield found only 5 percent of the prepandemic workforce returned to work in federally leased buildings in Washington, D.C., in October and November.

□ 1415

The Federal Government's abuse of telework has gotten so bad that Washington, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser has called on President Biden to suspend the telework policies for Federal workers or turn over Federal buildings in D.C. for conversion to affordable housing.

The current OPM Director has stated that Federal employees are actually

getting transfers to agencies where they can telework more—not so they can serve our constituents and the American citizenry the best.

The SHOW UP Act offers a much-needed solution to the problem of Federal agencies and Federal employees putting their own comfort before our constituents' needs.

It requires Federal agencies to immediately return to prepandemic levels of telework. This ensures that from the day of enactment, priority number one for the Federal workforce will be prompt and effective service to our constituents, not increasing the perks for an already privileged Federal bureaucracy.

The SHOW UP Act also requires a governmentwide review of pandemic-era teleworking policies. This will help Congress see how much expanded telework either improved or harmed agency-by-agency effectiveness, costs, and network security across our vast Federal Government.

The bill would prevent the Biden administration from locking in higher levels of telework until Congress receives detailed plans on how mission performance would be impacted.

If the agencies' plans show increased telework would substantially improve agency performance, lower agency costs, ensure agency network security, and better disperse Federal employees across the Nation, then increased telework can then be considered as an option, but not until increased telework has been proven to better serve our constituents and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this vital legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We strongly oppose this bill, which is an assault on all the progress we have made over the last several years in telework policy. Telework has strengthened private and public workplaces across the land, enhanced productivity, increased efficiency, improved the morale and satisfaction of the workforce, reduced traffic congestion, and made positive environmental changes.

When the chairman says it is time to return to work, I believe this is a misnomer because people who participate in telework are working. They are already working, and so they don't need to return to work.

This bill would take a sledgehammer to Federal telework policy and law, which the sponsors seem completely oblivious to, and you can hardly blame them because the leadership brings this measure forward without the benefit of even a single hearing in the Oversight Committee, which means Congress has not heard from the Office of Personnel Management or any of the Federal agency chiefs, and it has not heard from any Federal workers or their collective bargaining representatives. It hasn't heard from any of the stakeholders other than secondhand, I guess,

through hearsay the Mayor of Washington, D.C., who not surprisingly seems to be resistant, at least according to that report, to telework policy.

This is an arbitrary effort to roll back all of the progress that has been made under legislation and administrative rules over the last decade without any participation at all of the key stakeholders.

The bill falsely equates the development of telework as part of a balanced Federal workplace policy by OPM and the agencies with the sudden and near complete shift to virtual work in certain sectors because of the pandemic. Those are two completely different things.

This conflation produces nothing but confusion, and the bill is a wrecking ball against telework policy, which has been a critical success in so many workplaces.

Colleagues, the workplace is changing because of extraordinary new technology and a new focus on productivity and efficiency as opposed to industrial-age assembly-line seating and command-and-control work relations.

Before the pandemic, hybrid and remote work were already growing far more prevalent across professions, particularly for jobs performed in an office setting. The pandemic accelerated these dynamics not only in the Federal workplace but even more dramatically in the private sector.

From fiscal year 2019 to 2020, as we entered the pandemic, Federal telework doubled from roughly 500,000 people to more than a million. Practically overnight, traditional barriers to telework, such as technological obstacles and management resistance, began to disappear. Federal agencies implemented sweeping new guidelines as an essential tool for the continuity of government operations.

The pandemic, of course, will not last forever. Indeed, the President announced that he plans to end the public health emergency on May 11. The Federal Government will not maintain a pandemic-level telework posture in perpetuity, but we cannot ignore the lessons that we have learned over the last several years.

As OPM put it in its 2021 annual report on the status of telework, “there is no going back.” Enhanced demand in the national workforce and among Federal employees will continue as workers and supervisors report greatly enhanced productivity and focus from flexible work practices that reduce time wasted in endless in-person meetings, watercooler gossip sessions, and the proverbial BS sessions that overcome so many people’s offices.

According to a survey by The Conference Board, 82 percent of companies are going to offer hybrid work options to employees going forward, and the number of private companies willing to let at least some portion of their workforce go fully remote has tripled to an astonishing 36 percent.

In another survey, 63 percent of employees rated the value of 2 to 3 days

being able to work from home as equivalent to a pay raise.

To remain competitive with the private sector with which we compete, the Federal Government must offer reasonable telework options. OPM says it will, observing that we must appreciate the sea change in the American labor market.

Telework saves money, helps the government recruit top talent, reduces traffic gridlock, makes environmental sense, and ensures a continuity of operations at agencies that Americans rely on every single day. It is a lifeline for people who have disabilities or are immunocompromised, and it offers dramatically expanded opportunities for people living in more rural areas to enter and sustain a career in the Federal service.

We cannot enter a time machine and simply wish away the utility of telework in recruiting and retaining new generations of Federal workers. We should embrace telework as part of a balanced workplace policy to promote employee satisfaction and overall mission outcome.

OPM Director Kiran Ahuja offers a clear-eyed vision for the future in her annual report saying, “Federal agencies must continue to embrace workplace flexibilities, such as telework, to remain competitive for top talent. Decisions about telework, however, must be driven by delivery of mission. We all work for the American public, and how we best serve them needs to be the paramount consideration.”

That means telework does not make sense for every worker in every office or every activity. If you are guarding the Capitol, obviously you need to be present. If you are researching groups that were involved in the insurrection against the Capitol, you might be able to work part of that time virtually. Processing paper tax returns at the IRS may indeed require in-person work.

I will note that although people are blaming the problems with IRS responsiveness on telework, that does not make sense to me. Telephone work is something that can be done from the office, home office, or somewhere else, which is why we have been, on our side of the aisle, invested in increasing staff at the IRS because our constituents are so frustrated with being left on the phone and not getting answers returned about when they will be getting their IRS refund.

In the Inflation Reduction Act, we added 5,000 new positions for people on the phones to respond to our constituents. I know that some of our colleagues across the aisle have opposed additional funding for IRS positions, and that is surely a far more likely culprit than whatever telework policies are in place over at the IRS.

The Biden administration’s telework guidance seeks to strike a balance between getting people who need to be in person back in the office safely and helping agencies design their post-pandemic

telework plans to build off the prior successes of this policy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, let me state a simple fact that has evidently been forgotten in Washington: The Federal workforce’s primary imperative should always be to promptly serve the American people.

Unfortunately, what the American people have experienced over the past 2 years is the exact opposite of what they deserve. Thanks to the Federal Government’s pandemic-era telework policies which were instituted by bureaucrats in Washington, delay and disarray might as well have become hallmarks of Federal agencies and departments.

According to a Federal Times report from October of last year, just one in three Federal workers has returned to his or her office in a full-time capacity. It is abundantly clear that something must change, and House Republicans have the solution.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to serve as a cosponsor of H.R. 139, the SHOW UP Act, that is sponsored by Oversight and Accountability Committee Chairman JAMES COMER. Under this legislation, the Biden administration would be prevented from cementing pandemic-era telework policies for the Federal workforce until it provides Congress with a viable plan to avoid the negative impacts of remote work.

Yet again, House Republicans are acting on our commitment to the American people to ensure a government that is accountable.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the entire Federal workforce returns to its in-person capacity and fulfills its responsibilities to the American people. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 139.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will tell you a story about a couple that both work for the Federal Government. Earlier this month, the spouse of an Army servicemember, seeking approval to go work overseas for the State Department, contacted the Oversight Committee because she was being forced to decide between quitting her very successful Federal career for the State Department or returning to Washington, D.C., to continue her Federal service without her husband and her two children.

Her agency was fighting desperately to maintain her expertise and was perfectly fine with her performing her duties from overseas with her husband, who is in the Army who was being relocated over there.

Luckily, we were able to help make sure that her overseas telework request was approved.

Now, is that someone who is not really working? Do we want to tell her to get back to work?

Her situation is common for thousands of families in the Federal workforce where you have one member who is in the military who is being relocated, the other who might be working at a site in Washington who is now able to work out the terms of service under the telework policy, but that is precisely an element of the policy that will be crushed by the legislation that has been brought forward without the benefit of a single hearing in the Oversight and Accountability Committee.

Despite the fact that our colleagues have said that they will only bring legislation to the floor after there has been a hearing—and we are just a few weeks into the session—this legislation comes forward without hearing from anybody like this constituent who was being put in such a tough posture or the Directors of the agencies or the head of the Office of Personnel Management who is in charge of actually supervising and coordinating overall telework policy and making the annual report to Congress.

Telework is a vital tool for the government to recruit and retain and grow the talented workforce we need to make the Federal Government work. It ensures that Federal workers can serve the Nation even during disasters. Again, it was the preexisting telework policy that established the infrastructure that made for such a relatively smooth transition when we got into the pandemic.

I have to say that denials of telework for the spouses of military personnel are still common, and they are consequential, and they would be pervasive if the legislation passed. I hope that all our colleagues will reject this and at the very least send it back to the Oversight Committee for some real hearings so we can talk about what this really means.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

□ 1430

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is about common sense. For 2 years, our constituents have been calling our office and wondering why the IRS, the Social Security Administration, and the VA aren't answering their phones, why can't they get in-person meetings with Federal workers, why they have to talk to a robot on the phone for hours, or wait for months on end just for an email update on their case.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are going to stop the lackadaisical policies of the Biden administration. The SHOW UP Act is a wonderful bill that I am proud to support. It is going to make an end to COVID an actual reality.

Federal workers should do the same thing that the private sector industry has done, which is they have gotten

back to work for over 18 months, in large measure. It is time the Federal workers get back to work and start serving the American people to their full capacity.

This bill requires Federal agencies to return to the 2019 pre-pandemic telework levels within 30 days; reasonable, commonsense. The bill requires that Federal agencies show Congress how pandemic-era telework impacted their missions. Finally, the bill requires new oversight for agencies that seek to expand telework.

This oversight will help save money and create jobs outside the D.C. beltway. It is important to stress that this bill is not some radical notion. We are not ending all telework. We are just snapping back to 2019 pre-pandemic levels and ensuring a reasonable pathway for agencies to retain telework employees and, under the right conditions, allow for expansion of telework.

The bottom line is the pandemic is over. The American people need Federal Government to function. And in order to do that, we need our workers back. The IRS has failed to give Americans their refunds in a timely manner for 3 years running, and as late as last year, still had 12.4 million returns to process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding additional time.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Affairs Administration has hundreds of thousands of backlogged claims. As for the Social Security Administration, The Washington Post states, "More than 1 million disabled Americans, many of them poor and elderly, are waiting months or years to hear whether they will receive benefits. Processing times have doubled in some States and almost tripled in others."

So long as the American people are not getting the services this government is mandated to provide, we are not operating a government for, by, and of the people.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to address two points. One, let's grab the bull by the horns with this IRS point. The President's budget included \$80 billion to increase staffing and to update technology at the IRS so our constituents can get their calls returned. If you are waiting for your IRS tax refund, that is something that you have planned on. That is part of your family budget. If it is stuck somehow, it is extremely frustrating for people not to be able to get through.

Now they, bizarrely to my mind, blame telework for this, and they oppose the \$80 billion. I think they say that will create 75,000 or 100,000 new IRS agents who will be chasing working-class people around the country.

On the contrary, we have a report showing the \$80 billion will produce

\$200 billion in new revenue and it is rich people who are the ones who are being protected by the refusal of my colleagues to invest in the IRS.

Telework is a complete distraction. It is an absolute red herring. It has nothing to do with whether or not you want to invest in the IRS or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME), my colleague.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, Mr. RASKIN, for yielding this time.

A couple quick things. H.R. 139 is an overly broad proposal that stretches across the entirety of the Federal Government workplace to say that each and every telework policy, practice, and procedure implemented in response to the global health crisis must end immediately in 30 days because a majority of the House of Representatives says so.

Well, let's remember that in the word "telework," the last four letters are w-o-r-k. People who telework are working. They are working day in and day out. And they have been working through the crisis, working to get us back to where we need to be.

The bill says that the rest of America must then take time to study the majority of our edict today to see if it made sense in the first place.

Now, if that is not a classic case of putting the cart before the horse or the tail wagging the dog, I don't know. I do know that this is not how a deliberative body, particularly this Chamber, should operate. We should at least have a hearing on this, bring in the proper agencies, review this in a real sort of way, and then figure out what we do. To act this way creates a real problem. The solution, I think, is looking for a problem, and this is not the place it ought to be.

We have not talked with OPM. We have not talked with Federal agencies. We have really not talked with the IRS. We just condemn them. You have to remember, the 5,000 IRS agents we were trying to put in place on this side of the aisle were to augment what they were doing. The IRS has been slow in terms of responding. This was an effort to speed that up.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky's First District, Mr. COMER, and I, I think, want to get to one thing, and that is the idea of greater productivity, but I would ask that we think about another way to try to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Department of Defense Inspector General report dated March 30, 2021. The full report can be found at: <https://www.dodig.mil/reports.html/Article/2557812/evaluation-of-access-to-department-of-defense-information-technology-and-commun/>.

[March 30, 2021]

RESULTS IN BRIEF—EVALUATION OF ACCESS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATIONS DURING THE CORONAVIRUS DISEASE-2019 PANDEMIC

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evaluation was to determine the extent to which DoD Components provided access to DoD information technology and communications during the coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic.

BACKGROUND

In May 2006, the President issued the National Strategy for Pandemic Influenza Implementation Plan that requires Federal agencies to develop plans to maintain information technology and communications systems to continue operations during a pandemic. In response, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security (ASD(HD&GS)) issued the DoD Implementation Plan for Pandemic Influenza (DoD Implementation Plan) in August 2006 to ensure the continuity of essential functions in the event of a pandemic. The DoD Implementation Plan states that during a pandemic, special consideration must be given to social distancing in the workplace through teleworking. DoD Components' pandemic plans should include the use of laptops, high-speed telecommunications links, and other systems that enable personnel to perform essential functions while teleworking. The plans should also include the requirement to test telework procedures, the impact of Government-wide mandated telework on internal networks, and backup plans for communications infrastructure.

Apart from DoD pandemic planning, the DoD Telework Policy states that telework will be actively promoted and implemented throughout the DoD in support of emergency preparedness. The policy recognizes that during a pandemic, essential and non-essential personnel and Service members may be asked to telework; therefore, periodic telework exercises are required to ensure its effectiveness in continuing operations and an efficient transition to telework in the event of a pandemic.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, DoD Components began transitioning to maximum telework in mid-March 2020. On March 18, 2020, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum stating that DoD Components could execute their pandemic plans, or portions of their plans, at any time to ensure the ability to perform their essential functions.

To determine the extent to which DoD Components provided access to DoD information technology and communications during maximum telework in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, we administered a 43-question survey to a sample of DoD military and civilian personnel. In August 2020, we invited 269,282 DoD military and civilian personnel to respond to our survey to share their teleworking experiences from March 15 through August 26, 2020. We received a total of 56,057 responses, comprising 7,323 military and 48,734 civilian personnel, for a 20.8 percent overall response rate. We also conducted interviews with officials from the DoD Office of the Chief Information Officer, the DoD COVID-19 Telework Readiness Task Force, and the Offices of the Chief Information Officer for 10 DoD Components to obtain their perspectives on the infrastructure established to support the increased number of teleworking personnel.

FINDING

According to the 54,665 respondents who reported their telework status, the DoD transitioned 88.2 percent of respondents to

full- or part-time telework from March 15, 2020 through August 26, 2020, during the COVID-19 pandemic. Of the 11.8 percent of respondents who continued to work on site, the most common reasons provided by survey respondents for not teleworking were that their work could not be performed while teleworking, or they were not eligible to telework. Of those who teleworked, survey respondents reported problems accessing DoD Component networks, voice and video teleconference applications, and identified shortfalls in Government-furnished equipment available to DoD personnel when their Components first transitioned to maximum telework in mid-March 2020. However, the problems cited in survey responses lessened over time as the DoD increased its network availability and capacity, added voice and video conferencing applications, and purchased and distributed computer and communications equipment.

Based on the results of the survey and interviews with DoD officials, the DoD's initial challenges occurred because some DoD Components had not fully tested whether their information systems could support Government-wide mandated telework and had not conducted telework exercises with their personnel before March 2020 as required by the DoD Implementation Plan and the DoD Telework Policy. Therefore, some DoD Components were unprepared for the network and communications limitations, as well as equipment and application shortfalls, uncovered by the transition to maximum telework. While the Marine Corps, Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA), and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) were able to immediately transition to maximum telework, the Army, Navy, Air Force, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), Defense Finance Accounting Service (DFAS), and Defense Health Agency (DHA) faced challenges during the transition.

The ability of DoD personnel to perform essential and non-essential tasks while on maximum telework depends on DoD Components' ability to provide enough network capacity, communication tools, and equipment to enable the DoD's essential and non-essential personnel to stay mission-ready and productive while in a telework status. Some teleworking personnel reported that they found their own alternative solutions including the use of unauthorized video conferencing applications and personal laptops, printers, and cell phones to complete their work because some DoD Components were unprepared for maximum telework. However, using unauthorized applications or sharing DoD information over improperly secured devices, even temporarily, increases the risk of exposing sensitive departmental information that could impact national security and DoD missions.

Overall, DoD Components and the majority of survey respondents expressed positive maximum telework experiences. Specifically, 88.1 percent of survey respondents stated that their productivity level remained the same or increased during maximum telework, regardless of their Component's initial telework challenges. Many survey respondents reported a desire to telework regularly in the future (37,146 responses) and expressed appreciation for commuting less often (27,711 responses), better work-life balance (25,508 responses), and more flexible work hours (22,461 responses).

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the ASD(HD&GS) revise the DoD Implementation Plan for Pandemic Influenza to update planning assumptions with the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel, align the DoD

Implementation Plan with the DoD Telework Policy, and require DoD Components to update their plans to include revised assumptions regarding telework for personnel and the resources required to support the teleworking workforce.

We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P)), in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, establish management oversight procedures to verify that DoD Components have performed the testing, training, and exercise requirements of the DoD Implementation Plan and the DoD Telework Policy. The oversight procedures should assess the ability of DoD Components to support Government-wide mandated telework, including the results of tests of network and communications systems and telework exercises with personnel.

MANAGEMENT COMMENTS AND OUR RESPONSE

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (DUSD(P)), responding for the USD(P) and the ASD(HD&GS) did not respond to the recommendation to require DoD Components to update their Pandemic Plans to include revised assumptions regarding telework for personnel and the resources required to support the teleworking workforce. Therefore, the recommendation is unresolved. We request that the ASD(HD&GS) provide comments on the final report.

The DUSD(P) did not agree or disagree with the other two recommendations in the report. However, the DUSD(P) stated that the ASD(HD&GS) would work with the Joint Staff and the U.S. Northern Command to include the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel in the Functional Campaign Plan—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases, which will replace the DoD Implementation Plan for Pandemic Influenza, and align the plan with the DoD Telework Policy. In addition, the DUSD(P) stated that the ASD(HD&GS) would also work with the Joint Staff to include the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel in the Global Integration Framework—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases.

Furthermore, the DUSD(P) stated that her office would support and advocate for oversight procedures to verify that DoD Components performed the testing, training, and exercise requirements of the Global Integration Framework—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases, the Functional Campaign Plan—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases, the DoD Telework Policy, and the Pandemic Plans. Therefore, the recommendations are resolved, but will remain open until the ASD(HD&GS) updates the Functional Campaign Plan—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases and the Global Integration Framework—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases to include the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel and USD(P) provides oversight procedures for verifying that DoD Components performed the required testing, training, and exercises.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, based on 56,000 respondents to its survey, 88 percent of the Department of Defense respondents found telework accommodations increased their overall productivity. This is not my imagination. This is how thousands and thousands of them responded in the survey.

A similar 2021 survey conducted by the American Federation of Government Employees, which represents 700,000 Federal employees all across the country, found that 62 percent of them surveyed thought significantly that their productivity had been increased while teleworking based on what their previous levels were.

So Federal workers are performing for the American people and have been under the most difficult circumstances even before we got to COVID. I know that because I, like many of you, had a chance to speak to so many of them.

As the chair of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, this particular issue is welcomed before the subcommittee. I will convene hearings next week so that we can figure out where we are in a bipartisan way and move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I would make one point. Federal workers are not here in Washington, D.C., alone. That is the misnomer. Federal workers are in everybody's district in this entire Congress. They are looking to us to try to find a way to help them, not to punish them in 30 days. We are not going to save money on gas. We are not going to save money on energy. We are just going to go back to where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge that this measure be defeated.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, in short, the pandemic is over. It is time for Federal employees to go back to the office.

I find it interesting in this debate that one of the things that is occurring right now is that the President's budget is due next week. We are in the middle of this calamity around debt ceiling which the President, by the way, has led us to. His budget is due next week, and he is telling everybody he needs another month.

I wonder if this is because some of his own budget staff aren't in the office. This is something that should have been done long ago. If the President was doing his job being the leader of the executive branch, those employees would have been back. Since Congress is the body responsible for appropriating funds to the executive branch and the President does not do his job of making sure it is working effectively, then Congress does have a responsibility to make sure that these employees come back and get back to work. Life has been happening here in the people's House.

A couple of things: It has already been said about the IRS delays. It is shocking that right now it takes 2 to 4 months to get assigned an agent. If you call the IRS, you won't get a call back for 4 weeks.

It is also important to understand that right now it takes 30 days for USCIS to respond to a Congressional inquiry. There are many backlogs at the VA; some of them almost 2 years, 197,000 backlogs. How is that affecting the men and women who have served our country with honor and with dignity?

Mr. Speaker, this is simple stuff. Most of the American people have gone back to work. All we are saying is let's go back to pre-pandemic protocols

which does have telework provisions throughout all of the Federal agencies. It is clear, looking at the backlogs that have occurred through COVID-19 and continuing, the extended telework situation in the Federal agencies is not working for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should be supporting this legislation. This is good legislation. It will help all of the American people and, frankly, help the President probably pass his budget on time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, they complain about delays at the IRS and then they oppose funding to assist the overwhelmed workforce at the IRS, which is staggering under the weight of all of these obligations.

This is the first time I have heard that telework was the source of the problem, but apparently, that is what it is this week. Of course, we haven't had a real hearing so we have had no witnesses on it; somebody has apparently just dreamed that up.

It has just been linked to the debt ceiling. Interesting that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle has voted to lift the debt ceiling three different times under Donald Trump, who increased the debt of the United States single-handedly by more than 20 percent. All of the debt of the United States under one President. More than 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the issue at hand.

Members of Congress make very strange opponents of telework policy, not because we don't work hard, because I think we do work hard, but we use telework all the time.

Members of Congress might be in their district office working. They might be at a town hall meeting working. They might be here on the floor. They might be in a committee meeting, a subcommittee meeting. They might be meeting with constituents somewhere else.

And I dare say the vast majority, if not all of us, engage in telework. We wouldn't say to them, "Get back to work and stop teleworking." We understand that that is part of an overall telework policy.

If people have employees who they think are abusing telework, well, they have got a problem with that employee or they have a problem with their supervisor. But to my experience and knowledge, as someone who, I admit, may have been a little curmudgeonly, in the way we are hearing some of the Members are today, when the COVID-19 crisis started, the employees who are super productive at work will be super productive at home.

In my case, that is almost all of them. In fact, I think it is all of them. If you have an employee who blows off their assignments at work and doesn't turn them in, they will do the same thing if they are working from home. That is a question of supervision. The

real issue is, why all of a sudden they want to turn against a decade of progress on telework policy and start affixing to it all of these other problems.

For that, I don't understand, other than people seem to want to blame the Federal workers for everything. Those workers belong to all of our districts. They are all across the country. Eighty percent of Federal workers are not in Washington, D.C., Maryland, or Virginia. They are all over the country, working everywhere from military bases to Indian reservations to public health service. You name it.

These are our people. These are American citizens, and they deserve something a lot more than the implied contempt of suggesting that if they use telework, they are not really working.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for this day for quite a while. Whenever I go back to my district, I talk to my staff back there. Again and again, we hear stories that they want something done with the VA; they want something done with the IRS. It can't get done. They are behind.

It is time for people to get back to work. When I think of my district, I think the vast majority of people, their work schedule never changed even in the teeth of the epidemic.

Obviously, in Wisconsin, there are a lot of cheese factories in my district. Man, I would go home every night and there would be people there at 11 p.m., 12 a.m., 2 a.m. All of a sudden, we hear how horrible it is for Federal employees to have to go in.

In the current situation, what it tells you is—and this is true of many other programs, as well—the government works for the benefit of the government not the benefit of the people.

□ 1445

That is why people on that side of the aisle are trying so hard, so desperately hard today, not to have people come in.

I talk to a lot of employers all over my district. There were times that any given number of their employees worked from home, but they know it is not the same thing. Why in the world the government should be operating on a separate schedule, I don't know.

I will give you an example. The National Personnel Records Center is an egregious example. The NPRC is a large warehouse containing paper records of military members from before World War I to the 1990s. Veterans need access to these records in order to receive VA healthcare, disability pay, and home loans.

Despite these records existing in paper form only, the NPRC still decided to have its employees work remotely, a perfect example of the employees' interests put ahead of the

public's interest. This time, the public is veterans.

You can't copy paper records from a warehouse if no one is there to pull the records to make copies to satisfy the request.

These employees were paid, but since they were not at the NPRC, they were unable to fulfill their duties, and veterans were forced to wait to receive their benefits.

The SHOW UP Act will require these Federal agencies to return to pre-COVID levels of telework.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. By the way, I don't bring this up back home. We are talking about it today, but I think it is such an insult to all the people back home, many of which are whole factories that never took any time off, to be told that they have to wait for the Federal Government because their people are, I mean, my goodness, still at home almost 3 years after this thing.

Do you know any private businesses that are still having their people stay at home?

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

We often hear Republicans want to roll back the clock—roll back the clock on abortion rights to 1973 before *Roe v. Wade*, roll back the clock on teaching the history of American slavery to, I don't know when, 1860, 1619?

This bill actually rolls back the clock. It is right there in the text. The bill mandates "each agency shall reinstate and apply the telework policies, practices, and levels of the agency as in effect on December 31, 2019."

Which begs the question: What was the state of Federal telework in 2019? President Trump's administration had across-the-board limitations to telework at major Federal agencies that had made progress before, like the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture.

The overall telework participation rate had recorded its first drop since the enactment of the Telework Enhancement Act authored by myself and Mr. SARBANES of Maryland.

We had not yet experienced the onset of the global pandemic, which forced us overnight to move the Federal Government to a posture of substantially enhanced hybrid work. We deployed telework as the critical continuity of operations tool it should be. We procured the IT and IT security we needed. Supervisors figured out how to manage hybrid work.

At the height of the pandemic, 75 percent of the Federal workforce was, in fact, working remotely.

Not everybody is going to continue to telework full time, nor should they. Federal telework participation rates

have already decreased substantially as more Federal employees move back in person.

The most recent telework survey showed that 47 percent of Federal employees teleworked in the last fiscal year, but the fact remains that increased availability of telework is here to stay in the private as well as the public sectors.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics found that 80 percent of U.S. businesses expect increased telework levels to continue after the pandemic. That is in the business community.

That is the nature of the workforce of the future. We should be embracing the productivity and employee satisfaction gains realized through telework.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would have done just that, but unfortunately, we are considering this bill under a closed rule.

We should be using a measured approach to determine where hybrid or remote work might not be the best fit. I know I have done that in advocating for more in-person work at the IRS, processing paper tax returns; at the State Department, responding to passport applications; and at the National Archives, fulfilling veterans' document requests, all of which require in-person functioning. I have supported it, as have my colleagues.

I have also offered a telework legislation bill, the Telework Metrics and Cost Savings Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this would help measure cost savings and focus on using telework effectively, but this bill is sort of a one size fits all, come back to work no matter what.

Let me say to my friend from Wisconsin that I had a constituent die from COVID because there were no protocols in his Federal workplace.

There ought not to be any more casualties to COVID. We ought to have systematic protocols in place. That is what I think has to precede this kind of legislation we are considering on the floor today.

I thank my friend from Kentucky for introducing this bill.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, the pandemic is over. Joe Biden has said so. I don't know why he is waiting until May to do something about it, but the pandemic is over.

It is time for the Federal Government to get back to work. It is far past time for the policies of the Federal Government to reflect this reality and the policies of hardworking Americans and for Federal employees to show up and get the job done.

In my district, the Bureau of Land Management headquarters was a hot

topic of debate because this administration's—one of their first actions, they wanted to take that from my district and move it back to Washington, D.C. Why the haste? Why so fast to do this?

No one is going to work. The building is empty. They didn't have anywhere to bring the employees to a new building here. In fact, the employees that they did relocate to Washington, D.C., still only show up to work 1 day a week.

According to one disturbing report by the Federal Times, just one in three Federal workers has returned to their full-time job.

Equally disturbing, a leaked memo from January 2021 to the then-chief of staff of the Department of Health and Human Services showed that between 20 and 30 percent of the Department's employees did not log in to work on any given day between March and December 2020.

This negatively impacts all of our constituents.

The VA has been incredibly slow to fulfill records requests so that our veterans can get the care that they need, the care that they deserve.

The Social Security Administration faces a massive backlog of appeals.

As of last month, the IRS had a backlog of 2.5 million returns from 2022 that are still unprocessed.

This Republican-led Congress is moving to end Biden's emergency powers. He won't do it at the executive level.

We have created these agencies. We fund these agencies. Now, we are demanding that these Federal employees get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly support it. I urge adoption.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman makes an interesting argument. Of course, if physical presence in Washington is necessary, then that agency never should have been stripped from Washington and relocated in Colorado in the first place.

One could say that entire workforce is calling in or not really working because the entire office has a telework policy.

Obviously, she has carved out an exception for that. She thinks they can be effective, even though they are not in Washington, D.C.

Look, Mr. Speaker, this has been not just a closed rule but a closed process. There was no hearing in the Oversight and Accountability Committee. Despite the fact that those hearings have been promised, there has been no hearing about it.

Let me tell you one of the things we would learn if we actually had a hearing about it. The bill contemplates rolling the clock back to 2019 for every Federal agency. Well, what would that mean for one small agency, the Federal Communications Commission, which has decided upon a plan to reduce its leased office space with a savings of

\$119 million precisely because of the existence of telework, saying we don't need all that space?

Now, since we rolled the clock back and presumptively say you can't do that, we are going to be costing the taxpayers \$119 million a year because they have to go back to their prepandemic plan simply because we have this one-size-fits-all, categorical, cookie-cutter approach undertaken without any hearings.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office similarly would be forced to abandon its \$12.5 million a year in savings in leasing costs made possible because of reduced consumption of office space by telework.

Do we really want to say that we hate telework so much, that we distrust our own workers so much, even though the studies show that it is yielding benefits in office productivity, that we are going to force the taxpayers to pay more money for more expensive office space in downtown Washington, D.C.?

We haven't even looked at the question because there was no hearing because there was just a rush to get this to the floor so we could tell workers who are already at work to get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, to my colleague across the aisle, they need to get back to work. Only in Washington, D.C., and only with this President are we operating with COVID as a national emergency.

The only national emergency coming out of Washington is the economic disaster from the failed economic policies and the reckless spending of my colleagues.

It has created an inflationary firestorm, and people can't sustain it. Soaring interest rates, an economy teetering on recession, and \$5 trillion of debt that have us dangerously close to the precipice of a debt crisis is an emergency.

Our constituents across America have to go back to work. They have to take their kids to school. Somebody has to teach them. Somebody has to save a patient or serve a customer. They don't live in this fantasy world of Washington.

My colleagues, unfortunately, have used the public health emergency in large part not to protect the public from COVID but to promote the big spending, Big Government bailout agenda.

What I am talking about is this, in the name of COVID, bailing out student loans that cost taxpayers a tril-

lion dollars, bailing out schools that don't open their doors to their students. Bailout after bailout, that is what this is about.

While Democrats are jamming us with all these bailouts in the name of COVID, taxpayers can't get their Social Security benefits and their tax returns or their passports. You heard the stories.

Here is my question. It is a simple one. How can the people's government serve the people if the people in the government don't come to work? That is the question from my constituents in west Texas. Here is the answer. It can't. It doesn't.

If hardworking Americans don't have the luxury of not coming to work and teleworking for the rest of their lives, then the Biden administration and our government employees should do the same. Get back to work. Do your job. Serve the customer because that is what you signed up to do.

We are here to hold them accountable, with all due respect.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues seem to betray no understanding at all of what Federal telework policy is.

To say that the workforce is not going to the office and it is time to get back to work simply suggests they don't know that every agency, every commission, every department makes its own decisions about this as part of the complete workplace policy, going job classification by job classification, defining when it makes sense and when it doesn't make sense.

That is the way that it works, but they want to have a broad-brush, one-size-fits-all, straitjacket policy where they just decapitate a decade of progress, using the pandemic or the end of the pandemic as the excuse for doing that.

To repeat: This is not a Washington problem. The vast majority of the Federal workforce is spread out across the country.

The hardworking people we see in front of us today who work for the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and for the House are just a small example of the workforce located in Washington, which is a tiny minority of the Federal workforce which is all over America.

That flexibility has been given to Federal workforce supervisors all over the country to deal with. They would clearly try to elevate what I think is a frivolous talking point over the cost savings that have been created because of telework policies. They would elevate it over the increased job performance and job satisfaction that is being demonstrated in studies around the country. They would elevate it over the clear success of telework within the private sector.

□ 1500

Oftentimes, my colleagues will say we have to be more like the private

sector. It is the private sector that has been leading the way here. The Federal workforce has been very much in the rear guard doing it.

In any event, remember that they are conflating two completely different things. One is the Federal telework policy that has evolved over the last decade, and the other is the pandemic.

It is true that the pandemic response was made far more efficient because there was an infrastructure in place in order to make telework possible. Those pandemic policies can be reversed without destroying all the policies that have developed over the last decade.

There are an incredible number of unintended consequences that are exacerbated by the fact we have not had a single hearing on this question, which is of fundamental importance to hundreds of thousands and millions of people across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members to debate. I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman is prepared. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The title of this bill, the SHOW UP Act, consists of the Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act. I understand that in Washington—this really is a Washington problem—there is always a search for the perfect acronym over the actual meaning of the language, but this title does some real violence to the English language.

I don't know what an "unproductive problem" is. I certainly don't know what a "productive problem" is. I wonder whether the person who wrote that was working on telework or wrote it at the office. To me, it makes no difference. Somebody should have said that doesn't really make any sense for a title for Federal legislation.

In any event, the point is that Members of Congress, as everyone should know, are able to be very effective, often being in two places at the same time. You might be at your district office, or you might be at a townhall meeting in your district, but you call into a meeting with your chief of staff and your legislative staff, or you call in to have a meeting with subcommittee staff or what have you. I don't understand the sudden effort to demonize technology and all the advances that we have made.

I don't take this to be serious legislation. There was no hearing on it. There seems to be no effort to convince anyone that it is serious. I hope we can do better in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding and for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

When you look across the country, people have worked hard to get their lives back in order, to get their small businesses back up and running. States pushed to open up again because they knew that the health of their people, the mental health, the ability for kids to get back in school, was so critical.

Of course, data is out there all around but especially amongst our young kids. Many millions of young kids in America lost a year-plus of learning because of virtual learning. Not being in the classroom just wasn't the same. Those communities that made the effort to open back up again were able to provide a much higher level of education than those schools that went out of their way to shut down. Damage was caused to so many.

As you see most of the country now back at work, they look at Congress and say: Why isn't Washington back at work?

When you look at Federal agencies that are there to provide a service for the 330-plus million people all across this great Nation, Mr. Speaker, those people expect that when they pick up the phone and call those agencies—if you are a military veteran who served this Nation, you surely showed up for work. You showed up, in fact, overseas, in some cases, risking your life, receiving injuries. You want to get your military record so you can be eligible to go get the healthcare you deserve. When you call the VA and they can't get your healthcare records because there are still people not at the office—those are things you can't do remotely—those veterans wait for help. That hurts people.

You have millions of people who are trying to get basic services like a passport. Maybe they are trying to go on their honeymoon; or they are waiting for a loved one to come back home that they haven't seen who lives overseas, and they have been waiting for years; or they want to go visit a relative and have waited 6 months in some cases. We get calls to our offices on these problems, people who have been waiting over 6 months to get a passport renewed.

That is something you cannot do remotely. If you call that office and somebody is at home, they are not able to process your passport from their home, so you have to wait and wait and miss dates and deadlines.

When you see what is happening with so many other people who are counting on the Federal Government to take care of their needs, they wonder why they haven't gone back to work when they have had to go back to work.

You saw the President wanting to hire 87,000 more IRS agents. There are many IRS agents that aren't showing up for work. We still get calls to this day from constituents, hardworking people who live paycheck to paycheck who filed their tax returns in 2021 who still haven't gotten their checks back. They are wondering why somebody is sitting at home not able to process

that payment. Why do they have to wait over a year to get their money back from their government?

The answer is not to double the agency and hire another 87,000 people. It is to let people go back to work.

This bill just says to show up to work to do your job, to serve those millions of people who are paying your salaries and counting on you to get the job done.

This should have been done a long time ago. I am glad we finally are getting this bill brought to the floor. I thank the gentleman for bringing it.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This legislation asks every Member to answer a simple question: Do you put the needs of your constituents first, or do you put the preferences of Federal bureaucrats first?

We know that expanded telework during the COVID-19 pandemic harmed agency service to our constituents across multiple vital agencies. Instead of fixing those problems and making sure they never happen again if increased telework needs to continue in certain cases, the Biden administration is just blindly doubling down on Federal telework across the board—not to improve service to our constituents, but to dangle a shiny perk in front of existing Federal workers and prospective new Federal hires.

My bill ensures that a new expectation is set for our Federal Government's workforce: that you need to return to your agencies and get the job done for the American people.

Federal telework should only be utilized when it has been proven to improve agency performance, lower agency costs, ensure agency network security, and better disperse the Federal workforce across the Nation.

In the meantime, it requires Federal agencies to reimplement pre-pandemic policies, which were working just fine.

Under this bill, we will know that, whether we have increased Federal telework or not, it will only be to ensure that Federal agencies and their employees provide the best quality of service to our constituents and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 139, the SHOW UP Act, which was introduced by my good friend from Kentucky, the Chairman of the Oversight and Accountability Committee, Mr. Comer.

Millions of Tennesseans show up to work every day. However, more than half of federal government workers, who are expected to serve the American people, still aren't showing up for work. This has led to extremely long wait times and delays in services.

Veterans who showed up to work and served our country can't get their proper VA benefits. Families are waiting months for their passports. And in my district, a father waited for more than 8 months to receive his tax return. The entire time, he was left in the dark by the IRS.

Tennesseans deserve better, Mr. Speaker. The pandemic is over, and it's time to get back to work. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the SHOW UP Act.

Mr. SANTOS. Resolving casework is one of the most important services provided by our offices.

I was shocked to learn that my predecessor left behind numerous unresolved cases—but, in retrospect, perhaps I shouldn't be so critical. Maybe the simple reason is they were unable to solve constituent issues because he and his staff were hampered by the fact that agency personnel, were either unavailable, or, those who were, simply didn't have the resources available for them to process requests. Why? Because they are working from home.

Our functional system of government, how we get things done, was built to support a government workforce where our people come into an office, work together, in one place, face to face.

Around that infrastructure, we have businesses (or perhaps I should say we had businesses) that were built to support that workforce—small businesses, such as coffee shops, restaurants, dry cleaners, etc.

Most industries, who instituted telework policies during the pandemic have returned or have begun to return to their respective workplaces. And like the government, those businesses were designed around an in-office workforce.

This bill does not eliminate telework; it simply returns the workforce to the policies that were in place in 2019.

And perhaps, with the report, that this bill requests from the OPM, there is a good chance some agencies will show that telework or other arrangements make sense.

Fine.

But as of today; we the oversight body, do not have that data.

Let's reset—analyze where we've been and then move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R.139.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 75, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on March 13, 2020, in Proclamation 9994 (85 Fed. Reg. 15337) is hereby terminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 7, which terminates the March 13, 2020, national emergency declared for COVID-19 under the National Emergencies Act, or the NEA.

The time has come to move past the COVID-19 pandemic. It is no longer a global emergency as it was nearly 3 years ago. It is that simple.

President Biden said, in his own words, "The pandemic is over." He said that last September, and our Senate colleagues, with a bipartisan vote, agreed by passing a resolution last Congress, on November 15, 2022.

The NEA was intended to provide emergency authorities to the President to respond to extraordinary situations in which the President must act quickly. We are no longer in that spot.

The national emergency was declared by President Trump at the beginning of the pandemic, nearly 3 years ago, in March 2020. At that time, it was a new virus. The American public and the world at large had little information, and we had to get a handle on the spread of COVID-19.

Today, we are in a vastly different spot. We have treatments. We have better methods to track COVID. We have a better understanding of the virus itself, and the Federal Government has spent trillions combating the virus and protecting the economy from the fallout of the global shutdown.

At this point, there is no longer a need for the declaration to utilize the extraordinary authorities provided under the NEA. It seems that the White House agrees with this, too, but just thinks we need to wait until May 11.

That logic and math just doesn't seem right to me. Consider this: The declaration is scheduled to end on March 1 of this year, so the President is suggesting he does intend to, once again, extend the emergency. That is why Congress needs to act on this resolution.

It is simple. Absent the President ceding these emergency powers, it is incumbent on Congress to rein in the executive branch to ensure these powers are not abused and that these authorities do not continue in perpetuity.

America should be fully open. Our kids should be back in the classroom. Our families should be back at work. Here in the House, we are starting by removing this emergency declaration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 7, a resolution to terminate the COVID-19 emergency declaration, a resolution introduced by Representative GOSAR.

The coronavirus pandemic has been a public health and economic calamity for our country. We lost over 1 million of our fellow citizens to this deadly virus in wave after wave of devastating news for families. Entire industries have been forced to shut down and then restart from a standstill. Others have had to entirely reimagine the way they do business, costing billions of dollars in the process.

The impact of the pandemic was inequitable in the extreme. The digital divide grew even wider as those with internet access could work from home or go to school from home while others were left behind. Transportation workers, healthcare workers, law enforcement, and grocery store workers were all unable to work from home, leaving them at an elevated risk during a very dangerous time.

But thanks to actions of the previous Congress, including the American Rescue Plan, the CHIPS and Science Act, the Inflation Reduction Act, and the bipartisan infrastructure law, we are well on our way to robust recovery from this dark chapter of our Nation's history.

However, our work is not done. New variants continue to emerge, taking a toll on our workforce and exacerbating the labor shortage facing many businesses. Healthcare workers are still on the front lines of this pandemic. Last week, they saw nearly 4,000 Americans die from COVID.

Terminating the emergency declaration now sends the wrong message and

could have consequences for public health and safety. In my State alone, we had over 4,000 cases in last week.

The uncertain impact of long COVID, particularly on those with preexisting health conditions, adds a layer of complexity to our path to normalcy.

With these complex issues still facing businesses, local leaders, and the American people, it would be harmful and irresponsible to force a premature end to the flexibility offered by the Presidential emergency declaration from March of 2020.

President Biden has no intention of using these emergency powers forever. We know that because he announced his intention to end the COVID-19 national emergency on May 11. This May deadline provides time to develop a strategic and a thoughtful plan regarding the termination of these authorities. There is no need for Congress to act now before the President acts on this issue. Forcing an end to the emergency declaration without regard to the consequences is shortsighted and wrong.

There are many examples where a rushed move to end the national emergency declaration could have unintended negative consequences for the U.S. Ending the emergency declaration would roll back the enrollment and payment deadlines for individuals who have lost their jobs to sign up for COBRA or pay COBRA premiums. This will mean burdensome deadlines on consumers who get healthcare coverage from job-based plans, including laid-off workers and their families.

Ending the emergency declaration will reverse efforts to address mass incarceration and prison crowding by terminating the CARES Act home confinement provisions. This makes it difficult for the Bureau of Prisons to protect inmates who are at high risk of serious illness or death from COVID-19.

Ending the emergency declaration will end video court proceedings. This is inefficient and will cost marshals time and money if they resume transporting inmates back and forth to court.

Ending the emergency declaration will cut preplanned sickness benefits and unemployment benefits for rail workers. It is wrong to cut these earned benefits when rail workers need them most.

Ending the emergency declaration will also threaten Victims of Crime Assistance funding, or VOCA funding, a critical lifeline for individuals and children dealing with the aftermath of being a victim to crime.

The administration has a plan to bring the national emergency declaration to an orderly end on May 11, aligning with its commitment to give at least 60 days' notice prior to termination. I think this is a sensible and reasoned approach that Congress should support.

We shouldn't be using an ax when a scalpel will do. Rushing this resolution to the floor is the wrong approach, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the pandemic is over.

At least that is what we were told by President Biden several months ago in a September interview. Yet here we are almost 5 months later, and the White House has failed to roll back the emergency declaration.

In fact, it wasn't until House Republicans scheduled a vote to do just that, to terminate that declaration, that President Biden announced that he would actually end it on May 11. What he really did was announce that he was giving our friends on the other side of the aisle a little bit of political cover to vote "no" on this bill. Instead, they would rather continue to watch the American economy suffer for an additional 3 months while we continue this unnecessary declaration of an emergency.

I am glad President Biden has followed House Republicans' lead on this, but why wait months?

We can vote to end it right now, today.

We have already let this measure drag on for nearly 3 years, signifying an egregious abuse of Presidential powers. These emergency powers have been used to harm our economy and exacerbate our supply chain problems, and the President is content to allow that to happen for another 3 months.

Our supply chain doesn't need this to continue anymore. It needs to end now. It is time for us to stop living in the past. Americans are ready to move forward. They are tired of hearing mixed messages that the pandemic is over but still seeing all of the consequences of these emergency declarations and implementing COVID regulations.

Let's finally deliver on this promise that the end isn't near; it is right here, right now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying resolution.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just note that there is no record that the national emergency exacerbated supply chain problems in the U.S. There is every record in evidence that COVID exacerbated supply chain problems in the U.S., bringing our economy to a standstill, and in my view, every evidence that the investment in the bipartisan infrastructure law and the CHIPS and Science Act are doing exactly what they needed to do, to bring our economy back. There is no evidence otherwise. Just saying that for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 7, legislation I in-

troduced requiring the Biden administration to finally end the outdated and abusive COVID national emergency declaration.

Nearly 3 years have passed since President Trump rightfully declared a national emergency concerning the COVID pandemic. The factual basis for this declaration was apparent then.

As time has progressed and as we have learned about this virus, we know that it is no longer a national emergency. Since President Trump's initial declaration, the House of Representatives has not once voted, let alone debated, whether to terminate this national emergency or keep it as required—let me repeat that—required under the National Emergencies Act.

The National Emergencies Act requires Congress to review termination or continuation of a national emergency no later than 6 months after its implementation and at least every 6 months thereafter. Yet, former Speaker PELOSI repeatedly blocked my attempts to simply debate about the merits of extending or terminating the COVID national emergency declaration, despite the law requiring its review. That would make it almost four to six times we should have had this debate during that time.

What type of representative body cannot even discuss a national emergency?

Until now, the House of Representatives has failed to perform its most basic constitutional duty: checking the powers of the executive branch and the power of the purse.

In contrast, companion legislation has twice passed the Senate, most recently with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Last September, Mr. Biden declared the pandemic is over, cases are down, America has opened back up. This hardly sounds like a country under a national COVID emergency. Yet, Joe Biden continued to extend the COVID national emergency simply to force Americans to live under extreme measures that deprive us of our freedoms.

Just this week, Mr. Biden issued a Statement of Administrative Policy opposing H.J. Res. 7, implying to veto the legislation. This action stands in stark contrast to the recent promises that Biden would end the COVID national emergency in May.

Let's not forget that Mr. Biden once promised the American people that there would be no Federal COVID vaccine mandates. Yet, he soon lied and mandated COVID vaccines for millions of Americans.

We simply cannot trust if and when Biden will keep his word. The evidence is to the contrary.

It is time to end this emergency declaration now. If passed through the House today, the National Emergencies Act requires the Senate to expeditiously vote on my resolution within 18 calendar days.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and send it

to the Senate. Do your due diligence. Do what the law requires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, thank you for that announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity and would just tell the body and everybody listening: Not since World War II, and that crisis that our country had to deal with, has the cause of socialism and Big Government been advanced more than during the declaration of this national emergency.

People might disagree with me, but let me make it real for you. The Federal Government and State governments used this national emergency to stop people from working in their businesses, stop their businesses cold and force them to inject something into their body if they wanted to go to work, if they wanted to go to school, if they wanted to travel. If that is not Big Government and oppression, I am not sure what is.

People say, well, what does it matter?

Well, there are more than 120 special statutory authorities granted to the administration that are now going to go away. Everybody says: Well, he is going to do it on May 11. Well, he said last September he was going to do it then.

What is taking so long?

The rest of the country knows that the pandemic is over, and they know that the national emergency should be over, as well. They know that part of the 122 special statutory authorities includes allowing the President to suspend a prohibition on testing chemical and biological substances on unwitting human subjects—think about that—or allowing the President to shut down or take over radio stations or freeze any asset or financial transaction.

Indeed, the pandemic is over. The President announced it last September. The Senate, just in November, just a couple months ago, voted to end it overwhelmingly.

For anybody that is concerned about title 42, the statute governing title 42 does not make any mention of the emergency declaration.

It needs to be ended. It needs to be ended now. Americans need to be free and not oppressed by this Federal Government and these extraordinary powers that have advanced the cause of socialism like no other time in our history.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note that everyone is looking forward to the day when COVID-19 is a distant memory. But we have to work toward that day cautiously and steadily, and the emergency declaration should not be terminated until there is time to conduct a careful review on science. It should not be terminated on the whim of any one Member of Congress.

The administration has a plan to bring the national emergency declaration to an orderly end on May 11, aligning with their commitment to give at least 60 days' notice prior to the termination. I think it is a sensible and reasoned approach that Congress should support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, so the national emergency declaration was on March 13 of 2020, nearly 3 years ago.

This legislation we are talking about today passed the Senate twice with the votes of nearly two-thirds of the Senators. But the former Speaker repeatedly blocked the resolution from coming to the floor in the House.

The President is granted more than 120 special statutory powers—statutory, which usually means passing a law—through the national emergency declaration, all of which he continues to wield as long as this emergency is in place.

The President has extended the emergency twice, which would otherwise have automatically terminated on the anniversary of the first declaration.

These powers are meant for the time of actual emergency. President Biden himself has said the pandemic is over in his "60 Minutes" interview in September of 2022.

This administration has continually abused these powers and used the national emergency to enact liberal policies without the approval of Congress. These are things that probably wouldn't pass muster in Congress, because I don't think a lot of my colleagues would want to vote for them on the record.

Since the emergency was first declared, the Federal Government has spent over \$6 trillion in response to COVID-19. Students have lost invaluable time learning in school facilities. Countless businesses closed down that aren't coming back. Families have been separated from loved ones during holidays and at hospitals, unable to see dying loved ones and not even able to have a funeral for them. Heartless.

□ 1530

Nurses and docs, at one point called heroes, start to be called goats because they don't necessarily want to take an experimental vaccine.

We have Jekyll and Hyde ideas coming out of the administration now—thinking like, well, we are going to sue to make people wear masks again on

planes and trains at the same time he is saying we are going to end it all in May. It is crazy. We are going in the wrong direction.

Why don't we pass this legislation that the President won't do himself and put the power back into the hands of the people here that are elected by the people.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that if we are going to cite President Biden's comment that the pandemic is over, will the House also agree with the President that there will be no cuts to Social Security and Medicare?

Will the House also agree that President Biden has said that the economy has turned around, creating 11 million jobs, and the economy is robust?

If we are going to pick and choose what the President says to make any one argument, then let's look at the totality of the President's record, in fairness to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSEN for allowing me this time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill before us, H.J. Res. 7.

I am pleased that President Biden announced this week that he will end the COVID-19 national emergency declaration on May 11. This will provide a reasonable path to winding down the pandemic measures without leaving States and cities caught off guard with sudden shifts in their budgets.

COVID was a once-in-a-lifetime emergency, and an abrupt end to the spending under the emergency declaration would cause chaos for Americans. The wind down aligns with the administration's previous plans to give cities, States, businesses, and taxpayers at least 60 days' notice prior to the termination of the emergency declaration.

Mr. Speaker, this is sensible policy-making, and it is a welcome change from the prior administration's frantic, poorly-considered, and dangerous approach to any sort of emergency, including COVID.

I agree with the President's plan to wind down the emergency declaration, and I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with this plan, as well. Why?

Because this bill was rushed to the floor without allowing our committee to review it, without soliciting input from any of the cities or States that would be impacted. Nobody has been working with the Senate or the White House to find a solution that makes sense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the majority knows that abrupt shifts are bad. Yet, they are free to vote for a bill which they know would cause chaos.

They also know that it won't be considered by the Senate.

I can forgive a messaging bill; we all do that from time to time. What is so galling about the bill before us today is that it shows just how far outside the mainstream the Republican Party is.

The American people want common-sense solutions that protect our economy, not a far-right agenda driven by the most extreme voices in their party. It is the same voices that brought us yesterday's anti-vaccine bill.

Who knows what other secret promises the Speaker made to the extremists to secure the gavel?

Let's get the bill over with because we all know that it is not going anywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we can then get on to debating the majority's economic plans, like a 30 percent national sales tax or holding the debt limit hostage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so we can stop wasting time with this nonsense and get back to the work for the American people.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible what the other side of the aisle is saying. They said this bill was rushed to the floor.

Do you remember when this was invoked, the National Emergencies Act? March 13, 2020. After that we were told 15 days to slow the spread. How many days are we up to? Does anybody over there know?

It is over 1,000 days. What has happened in that period of time? How did we get to this position?

The law that Congress passed that was invoked by the former-President and extended by this President, the National Emergencies Act, requires at least every 6 months you vote on whether to extend it. We did not follow the law under the former Speaker.

They used the Rules Committee to prevent this bill from coming to a vote and then the claim that the Senate would need time to deal with this. The Senate has already passed this. The bipartisan Senate passed 61 to 37.

I expect there would have been a lot of votes here but the President came in to try to save their skin. The gig is up, but he wants to keep the music going a little bit longer.

Mr. Biden says that he wants to honor his commitment to give 60 days' notice before ending it because he issued this statement of administrative policy. He only issued this when this bill came to the floor; but he is going to honor his commitment to 60 days' notice.

Why is he taking 100 days? If anybody over there can do the math for me. May 11—is that 60 days from now?

No, it is more like 100 days from now, roughly.

The notion that this was rushed to the floor is ridiculous. Biden wants to keep it going. He wants to spend money under his emergency authorities, which he shouldn't have right now. It is very irresponsible with the debt limit looming and with us in extraordinary measures.

The reality is he wants 100 more days to shove money out the door and to waste money that hasn't been guarded very well or audited. It has been 1,000 into 15 days to slow the spread. It is time to end this emergency now.

Mr. Speaker, I support Mr. GOSAR's bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, back in September, President Biden said the pandemic is over. In early January, he extended his public health emergency for COVID for the twelfth time. Now he says the public health emergency will end May 11.

The emergency's been ended, then extended, then expired, when all of us know that it hasn't existed for months.

I guess we can say now that COVID will magically disappear in May because he says so. Who knows? We might even get new guidance tomorrow. I guess the Americans should watch out.

The American people—regardless of what was said on the other side of the aisle—are tired of this. They want to get back to business as usual. The American people are fed up with shutdowns that killed our jobs and restricted our rights.

We are going to end this madness now; we need to, that is why I am a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are fond of quoting the President and saying the pandemic is over. I just hope they will also agree with the President that we have had the 2 strongest years of job growth in history the last 2 years. We have had the lowest level of unemployment in 50 years. We have a new record low unemployment for Black and Hispanic Americans and record low unemployment for people with disabilities.

I hope as they are picking and choosing what they choose to agree with the President on, that they look at these facts, and also come out and agree with the President that these are also the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 3 years since the first national emergency declaration was issued related to the COVID-19 pandemic on March 13, 2020.

Since then, the Federal Government has authorized over \$6 trillion in response to COVID-19. Our children have suffered severe learning loss due to school closures, and countless small businesses have been forced to permanently close their doors.

The Democratic Party has used and abused the national emergency authorization to push their unpopular, radical agenda, like the eviction moratorium, student loan forgiveness, and reckless spending that has led to skyrocketing inflation that is impacting my constituents today—your constituents today.

When they go to the grocery store and are paying \$9, \$10, \$11 for 12 eggs, this is a problem. They also put unconstitutional vaccine mandates in place to put healthcare workers and our military servicemembers, serving in all branches of our military, out of work.

COVID is over. Yet, nearly 3 years later, more than 35 National Emergencies Acts are still in effect, and the current administration is continuing to abuse more than 120 special statutory powers only meant for times of emergency.

Even Joe Biden said the pandemic is over. We agreed with that long before he said it, and we are happy he is finally saying it. It is far past time to put an end to this abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Representative GOSAR, for his strong leadership on this issue. I am proud to be cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly support it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the administration has a plan to bring the national emergency declaration to an early end on May 11, aligning with its commitment to at least 60 days' notice prior to termination. This gives time for a deliberate and sensible wind down of the national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 7, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in closing, last year President Biden acknowledged that the pandemic is over, as has been pointed out.

There is no compelling need for the President to continue exercising the extraordinary authorities under the NEA. The Senate, on a bipartisan basis, agreed in November, and here in the people's House I think it is time that we do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 139; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 7.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

STOPPING HOME OFFICE WORK'S UNPRODUCTIVE PROBLEMS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID-19 pandemic and a plan for the agency's future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Balderson	Bishop (NC)
Alford	Banks	Boebert
Allen	Barr	Bost
Amodei	Bean (FL)	Brecheen
Armstrong	Bentz	Buchanan
Arrington	Bergman	Buck
Babin	Bice	Bucshon
Bacon	Biggs	Burchett
Baird	Bilirakis	Burgess

Burlison	Harder (CA)	Murphy	Kelly (IL)	Neguse	Sherman	Cole	Hudson	Obernolte
Calvert	Harris	Nehls	Khanma	Nickel	Sherrill	Collins	Huizenga	Ogles
Cammack	Harshbarger	Newhouse	Kildee	Norcross	Slotkin	Comer	Hunt	Owens
Carey	Hern	Norman	Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (WA)	Craig	Issa	Palmer
Carl	Higgins (LA)	Nunn (IA)	Kim (NJ)	Omar	Sorensen	Crane	Jackson (TX)	Pappas
Carter (GA)	Hill	Obernolte	Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Soto	Crawford	James	Perez
Carter (TX)	Hinson	Ogles	Kuster	Platts	Spanberger	Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Perry
Chavez-DeRemer	Houchin	Owens	Landsman	Panetta	Stansbury	Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Pfluger
Ciscomani	Hudson	Palmer	Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Stanton	D'Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Posey
Cline	Huizenga	Perry	Larson (CT)	Payne	Stevens	Davidson	Jordan	Reschenthaler
Cloud	Hunt	Pfuger	Lee (CA)	Pelosi	Strickland	Davis (NC)	Joyce (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
Clyde	Issa	Posey	Lee (NV)	Peltola	Swalwell	DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Jackson (TX)	Reschenthaler	Lee (PA)	Perez	Sykes	Diaz-Balart	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (KY)
Collins	James	Rodgers (WA)	Leger Fernandez	Peters	Takano	Donalds	Kelly (MS)	Rose
Comer	Rogers (LA)	Rogers (AL)	Levin	Pettersen	Thanedar	Duarte	Kelly (PA)	Rosendale
Crane	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Lieu	Phillips	Thompson (CA)	Duncan	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Rose	Lofgren	Pingree	Thompson (MS)	Dunn (FL)	Kiley	Roy
Crenshaw	Jordan	Rosendale	Lynch	Pocan	Titus	Edwards	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer	Magaziner	Porter	Tlaib	Ellzey	Kustoff	Ryan
D'Esposito	Joyce (PA)	Roy	Manning	Pressley	Tokuda	Emmer	LaHood	Salazar
Davidson	Kean (NJ)	Rutherford	Matsui	Quigley	Tonko	Estes	LaLota	Santos
De La Cruz	Kelly (MS)	Salazar	McBath	Ramirez	Torres (CA)	Ezell	LaMalfa	Scalise
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Santos	McCollum	Raskin	Torres (NY)	Fallon	Lamborn	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Kiggans (VA)	Scalise	McGarvey	Ross	Trahan	Feenstra	Langworthy	Scott, Austin
Donalds	Kiley	Schrier	McGovern	Ruiz	Trone	Ferguson	Latta	Self
Duarte	Kim (CA)	Schweikert	Meeks	Ruppersberger	Underwood	Finstad	LaTurner	Sessions
Duncan	Kustoff	Scott, Austin	Menendez	Ryan	Vargas	Fischbach	Lawler	Sherrill
Dunn (FL)	LaHood	Self	Meng	Salinas	Vasquez	Fitzgerald	Lee (FL)	Simpson
Edwards	LaLota	Sessions	Mfume	Sanchez	Veasey	Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Smith (MO)
Ellzey	LaMalfa	Simpson	Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Velázquez	Fleischmann	Letlow	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Lamborn	Smith (MO)	Morrell	Scanlon	Wasserman	Flood	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Estes	Langworthy	Smith (NE)	Moskowitz	Schakowsky	Schultz	Foxx	Lucas	Smucker
Ezell	Latta	Smith (NJ)	Moulton	Schiff	Waters	Franklin, C.	Luetkemeyer	Spanberger
Fallon	LaTurner	Smucker	Mrvan	Schneider	Watson Coleman	Scott	Luna	Spartz
Feenstra	Lawler	Spartz	Mullin	Scholten	Wexton	Fry	Luttrell	Stauber
Ferguson	Lee (FL)	Stauber	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Williams (GA)	Fulcher	Mace	Steel
Finstad	Lesko	Steel	Napolitano	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)	Gaetz	Malliotakis	Stefanik
Fischbach	Letlow	Stefanik	Neal	Sewell		Gallagher	Mann	Steil
Fitzgerald	Loudermilk	Steil				Gallego	Massie	Stewart
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stewart				Garbarino	Mast	Strong
Flood	Luetkemeyer	Strong	Boyle (PA)	Garcia (IL)	Pence	Garcia, Mike	McCaul	Tenney
Foxx	Luna	Tenney	Cohen	Jackson Lee	Steube	Gimenez	McClain	Thompson (PA)
Franklin, C.	Luttrell	Thompson (PA)				Golden (ME)	McClintock	Tiffany
Scott	Mace	Tiffany				Gonzales, Tony	McCormick	Timmons
Fry	Malliotakis	Timmons				Good (VA)	McHenry	Turner
Fulcher	Mann	Turner				Gooden (TX)	Meuser	Valadao
Gaetz	Massie	Valadao				Gosar	Miller (IL)	Van Drew
Gallagher	Mast	Van Drew				Granger	Miller (OH)	Van Dwyne
Garbarino	McCaul	Van Dwyne				Graves (LA)	Miller (WV)	Van Orden
Garcia, Mike	McClain	Van Orden				Graves (MO)	Miller-Meeks	Wagner
Gimenez	McClintock	Wagner				Green (TN)	Mills	Walberg
Gonzales, Tony	McCormick	Walberg				Greene (GA)	Molinaro	Waltz
Good (VA)	McHenry	Waltz				Griffith	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Gooden (TX)	Meuser	Weber (TX)				Grothman	Mooney	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Miller (IL)	Webster (FL)				Guest	Moore (AL)	Wenstrup
Granger	Miller (OH)	Wenstrup				Guthrie	Moore (UT)	Westerman
Graves (LA)	Miller (WV)	Westerman				Hageman	Moran	Williams (NY)
Graves (MO)	Miller-Meeks	Wild				Harris	Moskowitz	Williams (TX)
Green (TN)	Mills	Williams (NY)				Harshbarger	Murphy	Wilson (SC)
Greene (GA)	Molinaro	Williams (TX)				Hern	Nehls	Wittman
Griffith	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)				Higgins (LA)	Newhouse	Womack
Grothman	Mooney	Wittman				Hill	Norman	Yakym
Guest	Moore (AL)	Womack				Hinson	Nunn (IA)	Zinke
Guthrie	Moore (UT)	Zinke				Houchin		
Hageman	Moran							

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1654

Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCARELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. COSTA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 197, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—229

NAYS—197

Adams	Cicilline	Frankel, Lois	Adams	Clark (MA)	Goldman (NY)
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Frost	Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Gomez
Allred	Clarke (NY)	Gallego	Allred	Cleaver	Gonzalez,
Auchincloss	Cleaver	Garamendi	Auchincloss	Clyburn	Vicente
Balint	Clyburn	Garcia (TX)	Balint	Connolly	Gothheimer
Barragán	Connolly	Garcia, Robert	Barragán	Correa	Green, Al (TX)
Beatty	Correa	Golden (ME)	Beatty	Costa	Grijalva
Bera	Costa	Goldman (NY)	Bera	Courtney	Harder (CA)
Beyer	Courtney	Gomez	Beyer	Crockett	Hayes
Bishop (GA)	Craig	Gonzalez,	Bishop (GA)	Crow	Higgins (NY)
Blumenauer	Crockett	Vicente	Blumenauer	Cuellar	Himes
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Gothheimer	Blunt Rochester	Davidson (KS)	Horsford
Bonamici	Cuellar	Green, Al (TX)	Bonamici	Davis (IL)	Houlahan
Bowman	Davidson (KS)	Grijalva	Bowman	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Brown	Davis (IL)	Hayes	Brown	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Brownley	Davis (NC)	Higgins (NY)	Brownley	DeLauro	Huffman
Budzinski	Dean (PA)	Himes	Budzinski	DelBene	Ivey
Bush	DeGette	Horsford	Bush	Deluzio	Jackson (IL)
Caraveo	DeLauro	Houlahan	Caraveo	DeSaulnier	Jackson (NC)
Carbajal	DelBene	Hoyer	Carbajal	Dingell	Jacobs
Cárdenas	Deluzio	Hoyle (OR)	Cárdenas	Doggett	Jayapal
Carson	DeSaulnier	Huffman	Carson	Escobar	Jeffries
Carter (LA)	Dingell	Ivey	Carter (LA)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Doggett	Jackson (IL)	Cartwright	Españillat	Kamlager-Dove
Casar	Escobar	Jackson (NC)	Casar	Evans	Kaptur
Case	Eshoo	Jacobs	Case	Fletcher	Keating
Casten	Españillat	Jayapal	Casten	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Johnson (GA)	Castor (FL)	Foushee	Khanma
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Kamlager-Dove	Castro (TX)	Frankel, Lois	Kildee
Cherfilus-	Fletcher	Kaptur	Cherfilus-	Frost	Kilmer
McCormick	Foster	Keating	McCormick	Garamendi	Kim (NJ)
Chu	Foushee		Chu	Garcia (TX)	Krishnamoorthi
			Cicilline	Garcia, Robert	Kuster

Landsman	Pallone	Sorensen
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Soto
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Stansbury
Lee (CA)	Payne	Stanton
Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Stevens
Leger Fernandez	Peltola	Strickland
Levin	Peters	Swalwell
Lieu	Pettersen	Sykes
Lofgren	Phillips	Takano
Lynch	Pingree	Thanedar
Magaziner	Pocan	Thompson (CA)
Manning	Porter	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Pressley	Titus
McBath	Quigley	Tlaib
McCollum	Ramirez	Tokuda
McGarvey	Raskin	Tonko
McGovern	Ross	Torres (CA)
Meeks	Ruiz	Torres (NY)
Menendez	Ruppersberger	Trahan
Meng	Salinas	Trone
Mfume	Sánchez	Underwood
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Vargas
Morelle	Scanlon	Vasquez
Moulton	Schakowsky	Veasey
Mrvan	Schiff	Velázquez
Mullin	Schneider	Wasserman
Nadler	Scholten	Schultz
Napolitano	Schrier	Scott (VA)
Neal	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Neguse	Scott, David	Wexton
Nickel	Sewell	Wild
Norcross	Sherman	Williams (GA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin	Wilson (FL)
Omar	Smith (WA)	

NOT VOTING—7

Boyle (PA)	Garcia (IL)	Steube
Cohen	Jackson Lee	
De La Cruz	Pence	

□ 1705

So the joint resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Sablan, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Takano, Ms. Adams, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Norcross, Ms. Jayapal, Ms. Wild, Mrs. McBath, Mrs. Hayes, Ms. Omar, Ms. Stevens, Ms. Leger Fernandez, Ms. Manning, Mr. Mrvan, Mr. Bowman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Sherman, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Keating, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Bera, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Titus, Mr. Lieu, Ms. Wild, Mr. Phillips, Ms. Omar, Mr. Allred, Ms. Spanberger, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Kim of New Jersey, Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Manning, Mrs. Cherfilus-McCormick, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Dean of Pennsylvania, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kamlager-Dove.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Bera, Ms. Stevens, Ms. Sherrill, Mr. Bowman, Ms. Ross, Mr. Sorensen, Ms. Salinas, Mrs. Foushee, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Jackson of North Carolina, Mrs. Sykes, Mr. Frost, Ms. Caraveo, Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania, Mr. Lieu, Mr. Casten.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Golden of Maine, Mr. Mfume, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Landsman, Ms. Perez, Mr. Thanedar, Mr.

McGarvey, Ms. Scholten, Ms. Chu, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Mr. Pappas.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRANE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, February 2, 2023.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMPOSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 12, as amended by section 1(c) of House Resolution 78, and the order of the House of today, the Select Subcommittee on Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of not more than 21 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 9 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 29

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H. Res. 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

COVID NATIONAL EMERGENCY MUST END

(Mr. LAWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the House for passing the Pandemic is Over Act, the Freedom For Health Care Workers Act, the SHOW UP Act, and for ending the national emergency.

I was in the New York State Assembly when the COVID vaccine mandate was passed, and I argued vociferously against it. Even then we knew it would cause irreparable damage to our

healthcare facilities, forcing thousands of healthcare workers out of their jobs, and we were right. That is why it is so important for Congress to take this step and right that wrong.

Another refrain I hear over and over again from my constituents is that we need to end the national emergency declaration. We get calls every day in my office from small business owners, teachers, carpenters, and other constituents who simply don't understand why we haven't fully reopened our State and country.

COVID cases have dropped dramatically across the country, and the number of cases today compared to the same date last year are down over 600,000 cases. The fact is that this no longer constitutes a national emergency, and we should absolutely end the declaration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to pass these important pieces of legislation and encourage the administration to accelerate their timeline on this important matter.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month. This month, we celebrate the tremendous contributions of African Americans to the growth of our Nation.

Just one example of that contribution is the beautiful edifice that we are in today. It was built by people who were uncompensated for their work, but it is a beautiful testament in our Nation's example.

Black History Month started as Negro History Week in February of 1926. That week was chosen because it included the birthdays of President Lincoln and famed abolitionist Frederick Douglass.

In 1976, they expanded it and created Black History Month.

Today, African Americans make a difference in every aspect of American life and highlight the fact that the African-American story is the greatest success story in our Nation's history.

□ 1715

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, without objection, the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, the order of the House of January 9, 2023, and notwithstanding the requirements of clause 11(a)(1)(D) and clause 11(a)(4)(A) of rule X, of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. TURNER, Ohio, Chair
Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio

Mr. STEWART, Utah
 Mr. CRAWFORD, Arkansas
 Ms. STEFANIK, New York
 Mr. KELLY, Mississippi
 Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois
 Mr. FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania
 Mr. GALLAGHER, Wisconsin
 Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
 Mr. HILL, Arkansas
 Mr. CRENSHAW, Texas
 Mr. WALTZ, Florida
 Mr. MIKE GARCIA, California
 Mr. HIMES, Connecticut
 Mr. CARSON, Indiana
 Mr. CASTRO, Texas
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
 Mr. CROW, Colorado
 Mr. BERA, California
 Ms. PLASKETT, U.S. Virgin Islands
 Mr. GOTTHEIMER, New Jersey
 Mr. GOMEZ, California
 Ms. HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania
 Ms. SPANBERGER, Virginia

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 11, 118th Congress, as amended by section 1(b) of House Resolution 78, 118th Congress, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party:

Mr. GALLAGHER, Wisconsin, Chair
 Mr. WITTMAN, Virginia
 Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Missouri
 Mr. BARR, Kentucky
 Mr. NEWHOUSE, Washington
 Mr. MOOLENAAR, Michigan
 Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois
 Mr. DUNN, Florida
 Mr. BANKS, Indiana
 Mr. JOHNSON, South Dakota
 Mrs. STEEL, California
 Mrs. HINSON, Iowa
 Mr. GIMENEZ, Florida
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
 Ms. CASTOR, Florida
 Mr. CARSON, Indiana
 Mr. MOULTON, Massachusetts
 Mr. KHANNA, California
 Mr. KIM, New Jersey
 Ms. SHERILL, New Jersey
 Ms. STEVENS, Michigan
 Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Massachusetts
 Ms. TORRES, New York
 Ms. BROWN, Ohio

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(a)(1)(B)(1) of House Resolution 5, 118th Congress, as amended by 1(d) of House Resolution 78, 118th Congress,

and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic:

Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio, Chair
 Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, New York
 Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Iowa
 Mrs. LESKO, Arizona
 Mr. CLOUD, Texas
 Mr. JOYCE, Pennsylvania
 Ms. GREENE, Georgia
 Mr. JACKSON, Texas
 Mr. MCCORMICK, Georgia
 Mr. RUIZ, California
 Mrs. DINGELL, Michigan
 Mr. MFUME, Maryland
 Ms. ROSS, North Carolina
 Mr. ROBERT GARCIA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 12, 118th Congress, the second order of the House of today, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government:

Mr. JORDAN, Ohio, Chair
 Mr. ISSA, California
 Mr. MASSIE, Kentucky
 Mr. STEWART, Utah
 Ms. STEFANIK, New York
 Mr. JOHNSON, Louisiana
 Mr. GAETZ, Florida
 Mr. ARMSTRONG, North Dakota
 Mr. STEUBE, Florida
 Mr. BISHOP, North Carolina
 Mrs. CAMMACK, Florida
 Ms. HAGEMAN, Wyoming
 Ms. PLASKETT, U.S. Virgin Islands
 Mr. LYNCH, Massachusetts
 Ms. SANCHEZ, California
 Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
 Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia
 Mr. GARAMENDI, California
 Mr. ALLRED, Texas
 Ms. GARCIA, Texas
 Mr. GOLDMAN, New York

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES MACDONALD

(Ms. LETLOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Charles MacDonald, an outstanding public servant who has left an incredible legacy across the State of Louisiana.

Dr. MacDonald dedicated his career to education—working as a high school teacher and principal before becoming an administrator at the University of Louisiana Monroe.

After working 17 years on ULM's campus, Dr. MacDonald won a seat in the Louisiana House of Representatives. While serving in the legislature, he authored the bill that created the

Taylor Opportunity Program for Students, or TOPS, a scholarship program which has enabled hundreds of thousands of Louisiana's best and brightest to obtain a college education. I was fortunate to be one of the first recipients of the program over 25 years ago.

To this day, Dr. MacDonald's work in higher education continues, as he currently serves on the Louisiana Board of Regents.

He has been a mentor and friend to so many, including myself, helping guide young educators on their career paths, and we are so thankful.

Mr. Speaker, today the House honors an outstanding Louisianian, Dr. Charles MacDonald.

SUPPORT REPRESENTATIVE OMAR

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Representative from Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District in support of my colleague, Representative ILHAN OMAR, of Minnesota's Fifth Congressional District. Together, we are the Twin Cities.

Representative OMAR, alongside of our colleagues, Representatives SCHIFF and SWALWELL, have been unfairly targeted for removal from committees, despite their valuable experience, their expertise, and their perspectives.

The American people elected us to solve problems, to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and lower everyday costs. But, instead, there is prioritizing of issues that the Republicans are engaged in as a political stunt—no better than their extreme MAGA members who traffic in hate and violent threats.

My fellow Minnesotans and I see this for what it is: a petty vendetta that not only undermines our democracy, but it puts the safety of those Members at risk. Minnesotans and all Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support Representative OMAR and vote "no" on H. Res. 76.

CENSORSHIP OF CONSERVATIVE VOICES FROM BIG TECH CORPORATIONS

(Mr. LANGWORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring more attention to the censorship of conservative voices from Big Tech corporations, particularly with DIRECTV and AT&T's decision to remove Newsmax, the second conservative-leaning news channel in 12 months, from their programming lineup and their customers' televisions.

The fact that conservatives have this very important outlet stolen from them is simply unacceptable. This is just another great example of the Big

Tech censorship that we have seen time and again and we should not stand for this as Americans.

The American people deserve to hear all sides of political discussions to be able to form their own opinions on any given issue. Corporations should not have free rein in dishing out their woke agendas to censor content their paying customers consume. I will fight to get more answers on this as a member of the House Oversight and Accountability Committee.

DIRECTV and AT&T will be hearing from many of my colleagues and constituents that are on our side in this argument, as well as their customers from around the country to reverse this decision and prove to the American people that they are advocates of the First Amendment, not an obstacle for a fair and balanced political program.

ROLLING BACK PANDEMIC EMERGENCIES

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of responsibly ending the COVID-19 emergencies and in opposition to showmanship that would unnecessarily disrupt American's access to healthcare.

President Biden has committed to end the COVID-19 public health and national emergency designations by May 11, choosing an orderly, predictable wind down over the disruptions and dislocations proposed by House Republicans. Their actions this week could immediately kick tens of millions off their health insurance, leaving nursing home residents without staff to care for them, and cut off telehealth services for people struggling with mental illness.

Governing requires planning and deliberation. Unfortunately, Republicans have put messaging over substance. We can and will keep schools open and make sure government officials are delivering for constituents while sustaining flexibilities and efficiencies from the pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose these measures and support President Biden's responsible drawdown of emergency authorities.

BIDEN'S BORDER CRISIS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, as Biden's border crisis continues to cost American taxpayers billions per year, I rise today to introduce my first bill, the Border Security Investment Act.

This legislation will target the millions of immigrants who entered our country illegally, use American resources, don't pay taxes, and then pro-

ceed to send money back to foreign countries.

More specifically, it would place a 37 percent user-based transaction fee on remittance transfers made through money service businesses where the remittance originates in the U.S. and is sent back to one of the top five nations of origin for illegal immigration.

Revenue collected is placed under two trusts; both for border security. In the first trust the funds will be used by the Federal Government specifically for salaries and wages for Customs and Border Protection, physical barriers, and detection technology only. The second trust is allocated to reimburse States for their expenditures for border security enforcement measures.

Any unspent money under this legislation from these two funds exceeding \$50 billion is allocated to the Treasury solely for the purpose of reducing national debt.

While there is still plenty of work to be done, this bill is a first step in securing our border, keeping our communities safe, and working toward a balanced budget.

PROTECT OUR WATER

(Ms. SCHOLTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am on the House floor today to talk about an element that sustains us all—water.

My home State of Michigan is surrounded by four out of the five Great Lakes—our Nation's largest freshwater reserve. The Great Lakes region is home to 51 million jobs and has a GDP of \$6 trillion. It is an economic powerhouse.

Yet, despite the abundance of freshwater surrounding us, many of our constituents do not have access to reliable and safe drinking water. PFAS and lead contamination continue to be an issue for many West Michiganders. The Great Lakes are home to one of our Nation's most incredible landmarks but are under dire threat from climate change.

We must protect our freshwater supply nationally and internationally. The Great Lakes contain 90 percent of the United States' freshwater supply and 20 percent of the global supply. We have to work with urgency to protect this precious resource.

The importance of water nationwide cannot be understated. It is an environmental matter, an economic matter, and a matter of national security.

This week, I am launching my work on the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water and the Environment where I will work to protect this vital resource, and I invite my colleagues to join me.

ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IS THE ENGINE OF PROGRESS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, America has always been a Nation of trailblazers. From the automobile to the iPhone, the entrepreneurial spirit of the American people is the engine of progress that moves our world forward toward a better tomorrow.

As we chart a course toward rebuilding the world's greatest economy, we must ensure that this engine has the fuel it needs to get us where we want to go.

That is why earlier today I introduced the Startup Act, alongside my colleague from California (Mr. DESAULNIER). This bipartisan bill equips entrepreneurs and future entrepreneurs with the training and resources they need to start a business, create jobs, and grow our economy.

Having built several small businesses from the ground up, I know just how difficult that process is. I wonder how many Americans never make that leap simply because they don't know where to start.

The Startup Act is about removing barriers to entrepreneurship and expanding access to programs and tools that will help countless people turn their version of the American Dream into a reality.

□ 1730

THURSDAY LUNCHEON GROUP

(Mr. CASTRO of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Thursday Luncheon Group, which was founded in 1973 to elevate the voices of African Americans in U.S. foreign policy.

Since the early days of the State Department, patriotic African Americans have raised their hands to join our diplomatic service only to find their pathways too often narrowed by bigotry. In the face of this discrimination, early trailblazers like Ambassador Terence Todman, a six-time career ambassador and founding member of the Thursday Luncheon Group, successfully pushed the State Department to root out segregation and expand opportunities for all employees.

Today, the Thursday Luncheon Group plays an active role in promoting African-American representation at all levels of the Department.

As I have worked to increase opportunities for underrepresented groups in foreign policy, my efforts have been guided by the counsel of the Thursday Luncheon Group and other employee affinity groups.

Congratulations to the Thursday Luncheon Group on their golden anniversary. I look forward to working with TLG and similar groups to recruit and retain a diverse diplomatic corps that proudly promotes American values at home and around the world.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARCY GOODYEAR

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of Marcy Goodyear.

Marcy was born in 1971 in East Point, Georgia. She moved to Albany in 1974, where she attended Westover High School.

In 2009, after living in Albany for many years, Marcy found her way to Darien, Georgia, located in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Marcy loved traveling and spending time with friends and family. She enjoyed working at Skippers' Fish Camp with her family as well as her time as a city councilwoman with the city of Darien.

Marcy's smile was infectious, and she never met a stranger. She will be dearly missed by all of those who knew her.

On behalf of myself and everyone in the First Congressional District, our thoughts and prayers are with Marcy's family and friends.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SELMA POLICE OFFICER GONZALO CARRASCO, JR.

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we are mourning today the loss of Officer Gonzalo Carrasco, Jr., who, sadly, was shot and killed in the line of duty yesterday protecting the citizens of Selma, California. Selma, California, is a wonderful community of about 30,000 people in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley.

Officer Carrasco was a son of farmworkers, a graduate of Reedley High School, and worked constantly to increase his opportunities to become a police officer. He also, sadly, was preparing to become a father.

He served with the Selma Police Department for 2 years and did all he could to protect the community.

His service, bravery, and sacrifice will never be forgotten. It is a sad day for the people of Selma.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his family, the Selma Police Department, and the people in the valley.

May he rest in peace. God bless him. We owe him a debt of gratitude.

HONORING WAR HERO CHRISTOPHER MARIAN BALLABAN

(Mr. SANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Mr. Christopher Marian Ballaban, a constituent, war hero, and Holocaust survivor in New York's Third Congressional District.

Last Saturday, on January 28, Mr. Ballaban reached his centennial, and I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this token of my appreciation for his long and heroic journey.

Christopher was born in Poland and joined the Polish resistance against the Soviets at the young age of 16. Throughout his entire life, he was held in multiple slave camps throughout Europe.

After escaping the final camp, Christopher eventually joined the British Army and fought against Nazis in Germany and other enemy forces.

Finally, in the early 1950s, he found his way home to the United States. I could not be more honored to have a man of such valor residing in the district that I represent.

Let this serve as a public declaration of respect and admiration for Mr. Ballaban and his amazing family. I would like to extend the happiest of birthdays to Christopher, and I hope that our paths cross soon.

CONDEMNING BLOCKADE OF LACHIN CORRIDOR

(Ms. SÁNCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Azerbaijani Government's blockade of Lachin Corridor, the only road connecting Artsakh's Armenian population to the world. Today marks the 52nd day of the blockade.

My district is home to one of the first Armenian communities in southern California and was formed by survivors of the Armenian genocide. Now, in the face of Azerbaijan's aggression, many of my constituents fear a second genocide.

Last week, I spoke with a constituent who was stuck behind the blockade and who reported a dire situation: Over 100,000 Armenians have been denied access to food, fuel, and medicine, and the region has been left without heat or power this winter. If this continues, I fear a humanitarian catastrophe.

We must make it clear to Azerbaijan that imposing its will on the Armenian people by force is unacceptable. I call on the administration to ensure that aid reaches the people of Artsakh.

Today, my thoughts are with those suffering under these inhumane conditions, and I reaffirm my commitment to ensuring that Azerbaijan is held accountable for its aggression against the Armenian people.

SOCIALISM IS A FAILED IDEOLOGY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, socialism has failed everywhere it has been tried and has caused millions of deaths over the last century.

In 1932 and 1933, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin engineered a man-made famine in Ukraine that killed more than 3 million people. In 1938, 1 million people were executed by the Soviet Union's secret police in a campaign of organized terror.

From 1960 to 1962, over 50 million people died in Communist China during Mao Zedong's Great Leap Forward. Again, from 1966 until 1976, over 3 million people were killed by Chairman Mao's Cultural Revolution.

In Cambodia, communist dictator Pol Pot killed 2 million people, 25 percent of his country's population.

Almost 2 million North Koreans have been killed by that country's communist government.

These are just a few of the examples of socialism leading to mass death and suffering for innocent people. These deaths are a feature, not a bug and not an anomaly.

Socialism never works, as its critics must be silenced by force. It might sound attractive going in, but people who have voted it in usually have to fight their way out of it.

Let's be on the side of victims of socialism, the tens of millions of them, and speak out and condemn it in all its forms.

BLACK HISTORY IS AMERICAN HISTORY

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this day, the first day of Black History Month, unfortunately during a moment of unprecedented assaults on truth by those desperate to rewrite America's history.

In this troubling time of banned books and canceled curriculums, it is with great urgency that I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, to celebrate the profound history of our Nation that far too many far-right zealots are fighting to conceal.

This is a special month, defined in equal parts triumph and tragedy, and centered in pride and appreciation because our African-American forebears rose above oppression and helped create the greatest nation the modern world has ever seen.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, only the ashamed and the afraid hide from history. Black Americans never have and never will, for ours is a story of victory over adversity, determination in the face of uncertainty, and the courage of our convictions.

Our story is America's story. Let us never forget, let us never concede, and let us never be silent when we say that Black history is American history.

STOP EBT CARD ABUSE

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I go about my district, I like to meet with the average Wisconsinite to see what is on their mind. It is so much more illuminating than hanging around Washington and meeting with lobbyists.

Whether I stop in convenience stores or food stores, which I do between my meetings, inevitably the talk turns to abuse of the EBT card. I hear stories again and again of people selling EBT cards for 50 cents on the dollar, which apparently means that some people don't need them. Another complaint is some clerks are able to look at the card, or it turns up on the receipt how much money they have left on the card, and there may be thousands of dollars there, which is also a problem.

I thought: What can we do to prevent some of this abuse? We have introduced a bill called ID for EBT Card, in which a person's photograph would have to appear on the card.

When I speak to the clerks in my convenience stores, they unanimously believe that this would be a good idea and be a step toward fighting the fraud and abuse in this program.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA

(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation for another recent success for the First District of Indiana from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

Just this week, the Department of Transportation shared that the cities of East Chicago, Gary, and Hammond received funding under the Safe Streets and Roads for All grant program to develop plans for infrastructure projects designed to reduce transportation-related fatalities and serious injuries.

I am grateful for all the leaders and public servants in these cities putting in the work to successfully obtain and utilize this new Federal resource.

As we proceed, I look forward to continuing to work with all local stakeholders and my colleagues to support and promote the safety of our transportation infrastructure so that all individuals and businesses can continue to thrive and attract new economic activity to our communities.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN JESS SAENZ

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor my good friend, World War II veteran Jess Saenz, who was a member of the Greatest Generation. He passed away at the age of 98.

Born in 1924, Saenz was 19 and had recently graduated from Anaheim High School when he joined the military in 1943.

Jess was 1 of 50 young men from the historic Colonia Independencia, a segregated Mexican-American community in my hometown of Anaheim, California, who fought in the Great War.

Jess fought the Germans in the Ardennes of France and would later tell us his stories of how he lived in foxholes for 14 months, withstanding cold winter nights and drenching rains.

The war, he said, taught him to be responsible and made him a greater man.

Upon his return to the United States in 1946, he married Nellie, raised four children, became a carpenter, and helped build this great country.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting World War II veteran Jess Saenz, a true American hero and a member of the Greatest Generation.

□ 1745

WORKING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the 118th Congress is in full swing now. We are here working full time again for the American people.

I just wanted to take a few moments tonight here on the House floor to clarify some things about how this new Congress has begun.

I point out, first, for scheduling purposes, of course, the State of the Union is next week. It is a time for the President to take stock and speak to the American people about where our country is today and where we are heading.

I hope the President is able to make good use of the opportunity, but I am afraid we are going to be subjected to more spin and few solutions to the major challenges, even the crises facing the American people.

Mr. Speaker, much has been made by the Democrats and the press about how House Republicans have kicked off the 118th Congress, but we all know the chatter is not an accurate representation of what is really going on around here.

The cameras don't capture it all. We are delighted that the C-SPAN cameras are roving about the floor now. It gives a little more personal view of what is happening here in the Chamber, but so much of what goes on outside these walls is not apparent to the American people.

Let's be plain about this. Let's put it plainly in real terms what is actually happening now. There are some real reforms that have been brought forward by the new House Republican majority.

We now have a much more open legislative process. As I explained to some friends back home over the weekend, we all remember the cartoon. I am 51 years old. We remember the cartoon Saturday mornings, "I am just a bill on Capitol Hill," and it explained how a bill becomes a law. I explained to our friends from Louisiana who were in town that that has not actually been the way a bill becomes a law in this Congress for several years now.

We are getting back to that process. We are getting back to what we were taught in civics about how this is supposed to work. Bills have to be limited now to one single subject. We will no longer vote on a bill without giving Members at least 72 hours' notice to review it first. What a concept. You might have to actually read that legislation before you vote on it.

This is an important change: Any tax increase must now meet a higher threshold to pass. It was a simple majority, but now it is a two-thirds vote. That is a really important reform for the American people, given the state of the economy.

There will be no new mandatory Federal spending increases without equal or greater budget offsets. We have a \$31.5 trillion Federal debt. We cannot continue on this trajectory. These reforms are really important for us.

By the way, remote voting and committee work are finally ended. No longer will you see Members phoning in their work. They have to be here. They have to come to work.

Let's contrast that with the old way of doing business. Under the previous leadership of former Speaker NANCY PELOSI—the Democrats had been in charge here for 4 years—we had bills written behind closed doors, sometimes literally by just a handful of people. The bills were loaded up with unrelated policies. These bills were unveiled, then brought for a remote vote before anybody could possibly read them, much less debate or amend the legislation.

We all know the Democrats are obsessed with having a top-down approach to legislating. I mean, they have all but shouted it from the rooftops over the past few weeks. Sure, that might have made former Speaker PELOSI's job easier, but it was not good for the American people. It was not good for the country. It was not good for this revered institution.

I suspect if you ask the American people, they would all agree. This is just common sense. We are restoring common sense here. We made commitments to America, and we are going to fulfill them.

Here is the reality: House Republicans have started this year by instituting the most positive reforms to this House in a generation. With Republicans back in charge, the status

quo, where there is no transparency, no accountability, outright disregard for regular order, is finally over, and that is a very, very good thing for the country.

Mr. Speaker, this week we are voting to end the COVID pandemic emergency order. This is one of the topics we have taken up, we have committed to the American people that we would do it when we started the Congress, and we have.

President Biden has said the pandemic is over. His press secretary says it isn't. Since the White House couldn't get its story straight, we voted now to put an end to the public health emergency declaration. Since the pandemic is over, the emergency declaration should be over as well.

Mr. Speaker, this week we are also passing the SHOW UP Act. Talk about something that is popular with the American people. This House has ended remote work in this body, the Senate did it long ago across the hall, and now we are voting to do the same thing for the remainder of the Federal Government. It is beyond time to require that the teleworking Federal employees return to work in order to remedy widespread terribly poor customer service.

Consider this: The IRS, just the IRS, they have a backlog right now of more than 8 million tax returns from 2021. Prior to widespread teleworking, the backlog was approximately just 1 million. That is an unacceptable thing. We have Federal employees at all these agencies who literally have not come to work. Well, we are going to end that. It is clear that these backlogs and customer service problems are due at least in part to ongoing teleworking policies, even as the pandemic is now in the rearview mirror.

Mr. Speaker, with Republicans back in charge, I could give you many examples of things that are going to be improving around here. That is just a couple. The House is back to work, and we intend to get the rest of the government back to work for the American people as well, whether all of our colleagues like that or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. KILEY), my new colleague on the House Judiciary Committee, to discuss another important issue from this week.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House passed the Pandemic is Over Act, terminating the national COVID-19 state of emergency.

Now, of course, the pandemic is over. It has been over for some time. Americans are well aware of this. It seems only the government has not been aware of it at the national level and in certain States in this country.

The House of Representatives passed this bill ending the state of emergency, ending the national emergency, and the President responded in a very interesting way. He agreed with us. He said: Yes, the emergency is over on May 11, which is a very interesting concept. An emergency that you can schedule to end in advance.

This is a page out of Gavin Newsom's book in California where the state of emergency there had continued month after month, year after year, and as the absurdities piled up, as California last year hosted the Super Bowl during a state of emergency.

As, by the way, the Governor refused to abide personally by the dictates issued pursuant to that emergency, eventually he was forced to say, okay, I will end it, and he decided to end it 6 months in advance. The state of emergency in California will now be lapsing on February 28, for those keeping score at home, and the national emergency will be lapsing on May 11.

This is inherently against the very concept of an emergency, to say that we can schedule it to end at a specific date in the future. It is also against the very concept of an emergency to say that it can last for 3 years.

We have in this country for now almost 3 years experienced our form of government being turned on its head. At the national level, and in particular certain States, our entire separation of powers, checks and balances, and representative government collapsed under a one-man rule.

Now that we have moved on from most of that—although there are still some remnants of the controls that were put in place still in effect—we are in a position to assess what was the outcome of all this. Yes, there was some uniformity in terms of Federal policy, but there was a great degree of difference in terms of how different States responded.

In my State of California, we had the highest level of government coercion and control throughout the entire COVID-19 experience. We had the most onerous business shutdowns, the longest school shutdowns, the worst church shutdowns. We had the most onerous mask mandates and vaccine mandates and vaccine passports.

Each and every step of the way, California had the highest level of government coercion and control, generally done via executive orders without the say of the people, without the say of the legislature, without meaningful judicial review, with 40 million people of our State expected to simply comply. That was the California experience. That was the experience to a lesser extent of many other States.

But then you had States like Florida that decided that citizens could be trusted to make decisions for themselves, that empowered local communities to govern themselves, that focused on disease control rather than population control.

We can now look, having been through this for a few years and having had very different approaches, what was the result of this difference in policy?

Well, economically speaking, California had basically the highest unemployment rate in the entire country throughout the COVID-19 state of emergency, whereas Florida had just

about the lowest unemployment rate in the country throughout the state of emergency.

California has experienced student learning loss unlike anything that has ever been seen before in this country. There has been a 6 percent decline in third graders reading at grade level over the last few years, a 7 percent decline for fourth graders in meeting ELA standards, whereas Florida achieved the highest national assessment of educational progress ranking in their history across math and reading for fourth and eighth graders in 2022.

In California, to take another example, in L.A. our students lost an equivalent of 6 months of math in terms of their overall education in that period of time. We will be grappling with the consequences of this for a long, long time. California experienced an economic and educational calamity that States like Florida did not experience.

What did we get in return?

We were all told this was done for the purpose of safety. It was done in order to save lives. We can now assess that claim.

When you look at the actual numbers, there was no difference. Age-adjusted COVID mortality rates between California and Florida were a wash. It was the same, despite the unbelievable toll that the lockdowns and related policies took on the people of California.

You can also make comparisons within our State. I represent a number of counties that did everything possible to take the approach that Florida did despite what we were dealing with at the State level.

In Placer County, for example, we were the first county in the State to end the local state of emergency. We had our kids back in school earlier than anywhere else in California. We were among the first to end mask mandates and to challenge vaccine mandates, and we did everything possible to enable our businesses to remain open. All the while, we took the steps that were necessary to give vulnerable individuals the tools that they needed to protect themselves.

Now, all the while, those of us who favored trusting citizens, who favored freedom, were attacked viciously by the likes of the Governor of California, who personally attacked me by name and said that I believed it would have been better to let Californians die.

Again, you can look at the results in Placer County as compared to other parts of California. Our students did much better, our employment rate was roughly half the State average, and our public health outcomes were much better, with a COVID mortality rate about two-thirds that of the rest of the State.

The evidence now is very clear as to what approach worked and what approach didn't. Those States that tried as much as possible to maintain the structure of our constitutional form of government did a lot better than those

States that decided an emergency could be used to effectuate an indeterminate one-man rule.

But there are some who are now saying, as a recent headline in *The Atlantic* magazine put it, that we should simply declare a pandemic amnesty at this point. We should move on, we should forget about all of the damage that was done to our kids, who may never get the education, may never make up for the learning loss that they experienced. We should forget about the damage that was done to businesses that in many cases have been permanently lost, 200,000 businesses throughout the country that were shuttered. We should simply move on and forget about it. Forgive and forget.

Look, I am all for letting bygones be bygones, and I am willing to work with anyone who is interested in creating good policy going forward. But we do need to pause and consider how it is that this happened in our country, how did we get to a point where the appearance of a virus could cause our entire form of government to collapse?

□ 1800

Our Founders were not unfamiliar with emergencies. After all, they had just been through a war of independence and yet, they still believed that combining the executive, legislative, and judicial powers in a single set of hands, as James Madison put it, was the very definition of tyranny.

So how, well over two centuries now after the founding, did we get to a point where our institutions were so susceptible to collapse?

I think that is a question that merits serious scrutiny because it could point us in the direction of getting back to some of the founding principles that we have lost touch with.

The fact is that we have seen governmental power become more and more centralized and consolidated in recent decades in this country, and it simply became all too easy to fast-forward that process to its logical endpoint of one-man rule.

We have seen our political institutions become less and less representative, less and less self-governing institutions, and it became all too easy to make them not representative at all. Or we have seen more and more of our levers of power in government controlled by special interest groups, especially in California, my State, and so it became all too easy to let special interests completely run the show as it did when it came to the school shutdowns.

So I don't believe that we can simply move on and turn the page and forget about what happened in this country for the last few years. I think we need to give serious thought as to what led us to this point and how we can move ahead and actually now get the pendulum swinging in the other direction. That is a far more in-depth conversation than my time today would permit, but I simply would like to offer a few ideas.

The first is that we need to definitively end the emergency, not on May 11 but now, not in California on February 28, but now, and any other States that are retaining the altered legal forms that were put in place through the emergency. Along with that, we need to end all remaining mandates that exist.

We took a major step in that direction yesterday in this House by passing legislation to end President Biden's vaccine mandate for healthcare workers.

We also need to look at reforming our emergency laws, to make it so you cannot so easily declare an emergency that lasts for years and is allowed to continue indefinitely without any serious review of whether the conditions of the emergency continue to exist.

In a broader sense, I think that this is a moment where we as a country need to look at the consolidation and centralization of political power in this country. Yes, at the State level but largely at the Federal level, and especially in bureaucracies that operate outside any sort of accountability on the part of voters.

We simply have seen this happen over the course of decades in this country, and it has veered us farther and farther from the idea of self-government that was the great American innovation: the institution of self-government.

Now I am seeing encouraging signs in many ways that this is beginning to happen. For example, I am starting to see at the school board level, parents are getting involved like never before. Parents are running for school board and changing the way that local school districts operate and trying to fight against mandates from the State level that tell them how they should run their schools.

The beauty of this is that it gives parents a direct access point in terms of how their local schools are run. That is the idea of self-government, and I think that is something to build on going forward.

Finally, on the note of education, I do think we need to get much more serious in this country about civic education which used to be something that was not simply some addendum to one of your classes but was part and parcel of your entire education: what it was about, to prepare you for active citizenship, to be well grounded in what has made America such a unique country in our Nation's history, the greatest country in the world's history; what the Constitution is about; why we have institutions like freedom of speech; why the separation of powers and checks and balances are important.

I think if we start to teach these things more meaningfully in our schools, then it would reinforce our civic institutions. It would leave them less vulnerable to the sort of transformation that they were put through over the course of the last few years. And should we ever face another pandemic or whatever other threat that

may come our way, I think we will be much better prepared to get through it in the way that Florida did and in the way that Placer County did. And not, unfortunately, in the way that California and many other parts of this country had to suffer through with such a high cost to so many people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California. Those are some very important insights from the West Coast. We pray that America does not make those same decisions in the other States. I am grateful for principled leadership out of California here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this week things have—the quality of intellectual thought in this country has declined to the degree that we have to bring a resolution to the floor condemning socialism, but that is the way it is.

Recently, polls have shown among young people, about half have a positive view of socialism. Now, of course these are young people whose opinions are largely gathered not by personal experience but by what their schoolteachers tell them or what they see on television, so that may be part of the problem, and hopefully, they will grow their way out of it.

Nevertheless, I do feel it necessary to make some statements as to why socialism is an inferior way to govern and is completely incompatible with people who want to live in a free society.

The first thing you need to know about socialism, of course, it leads to material goods which are not as good as those under a free market system. A lot of that means because the government controls everything, you don't have an opportunity to have competition. The poor restaurant, the poor manufacturer is never forced out of business, never forced to improve, and as a result it means a poorer society. A lot of times the material goods by themselves is one of the reasons throughout history you see people leave the Marxist, socialist sort of society and flee towards the free market system.

Cubans leaving to come to the United States. When I visit the southern border, the Border Patrol always talks about the Cubans. There are a lot of Cuban doctors coming here—wealthy by Cuban standards—but still they can become much more wealthy in the U.S.

In the old days of the Cold War, people left from East Germany to West Germany, from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to get to a country in which there are more goods and more quality. But I always feel it is a little bit wrong to overly focus on the fact that the free market inevitably means much better material wealth.

It also deals with the freedom to do anything else. When you have a socialist society, the government in a pure

socialist society employs everybody. And even in a partially socialist society, a much higher percentage of people wind up working for the government and have to work for the government.

Like all Republicans, in my political career, again and again, I have had people come up to me and tell me things privately that they can't say publicly because they work for the government.

Schoolteachers who come up to me and give a Republican perspective on things or things they may disagree with that the school board is doing. But because they work for the government, they can only talk to me quietly like they were in the Soviet Union or Communist China.

When I was in Wisconsin and we changed the laws to give more flexibility on how we deal with public employees about 12 years ago—it was under Governor Walker—all Republicans knew public employees who quietly sided with Governor Walker, but because they worked for the government, the little socialist part of America, they couldn't openly side with Governor Walker. They had to quietly whisper like we were in a Communist country.

That is what happens when you have too many people working for the government.

The Department of Natural Resources is another example of that. Again, people are coming and saying they are doing things wrong, but they dare not say so publicly because they work for the government.

Of course, in addition to employees who work for the DNR or work for the university, it is not just political beliefs that they may have to hide in the intolerance area of a very liberal political entity—I am thinking about Dane County, which is where Madison, Wisconsin is—people, again, where the government is so big, they are forced not only to hide their political beliefs, they may have to hide their religious beliefs because they are afraid that when it comes to promotions, when it comes to hiring, when it comes to firing, it could affect them negatively because such a high percentage of jobs come with the government.

It is not just that. In a pure socialist society, because there is a shortage of goods, the ability to purchase goods can also be dependent on toeing the party line. We know that in Russia, or previously Cuba, the ability to purchase things is dependent on toeing the party line. You can work all you want but unless you are a member of the party or toe the party line, you can't get the quality of goods that are there. That is inevitably something that happens when the government becomes so powerful.

Other perks are restricted if you don't toe the party line, things like travel in a socialist state. Over time, you begin to have restrictions and maybe the opportunities to travel abroad are only given to people who have displayed fealty to the state.

One of the things I am told to look out for in Cuba is—Cuba, of course, being an island nation—you would expect to have lots of boats all around the island for people to go and fish, people just to take advantage of the Caribbean. But in fact, there are very few boats because Cuba is a socialist country and they are afraid people would use those boats to leave the country. That is another trait that you have in advanced socialism.

Other things they may stamp down on you for, they restrict your free speech because they don't want anybody saying anything that might be something the government disagrees with.

If you look at Communist China, even though to a degree they have a free market, the huge government, because they are afraid of any dissent, anybody telling the truth, cracks down on churches. It seems hard to believe that you cannot openly talk about Christianity, openly talk about Christ in China, but I am afraid you can't.

You hear about Falun Gong in China saying things that maybe aren't approved by the government and therefore people crack down on that organization as well.

In any event, when young people say they are for socialism or if you have any children or grandchildren out there who say there is socialism, point out to them the inevitable lack of freedom that comes with it, that a high number of people have to work for the government. And if you have to work for the government, they can promote you or hire you or fire you based upon political beliefs, based upon religious beliefs.

In a free market system, there are really an almost unlimited number of people you can work with. There are so many different businesses in the free market system. If you don't like to work for someone else, you can always start your own business. That is something that you can't do under socialism, or they want to make it very difficult.

So I am glad that the United States Congress, at least later this week or early next week, is going to go on record saying that we don't like socialism. It should be completely unnecessary. And the fact that so many young people think socialism might be okay is really a damning indictment of the educational, both K-12 and university, system in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. That is very well said. The evils of socialism have crept into all manner of our politics and areas of our culture.

Mr. Speaker, I will end our Special Order hour by just reminding the American people here watching and keeping track of this, that again, as I said in the opening, the Republican majority is in charge. The Congress is now fully operational and we are back to work for the American people.

Every week now, we will be passing substantive legislation that will send a message to the people that there is a new sheriff in town.

Today, in our House Committee on the Judiciary, we had an hour's long hearing on the catastrophe at the border, hearing from those who are down there contending with that situation every single day. The hearings like that one will lead us to legislative repairs for some of these problems that have been created by the Biden administration and the Democrats in charge here the last couple of years.

This week, we are voting to end the COVID pandemic emergency order at long last. We are passing the SHOW UP Act to get all these Federal employees back to work. And as Mr. GROTHMAN indicated, tomorrow we will be voting to condemn socialism.

There is going to be a dramatic change between the Republicans in charge of this House and the Democrats. We are grateful for the opportunity to lead. We will do that every day and we will make the American people proud with our policy reforms and our process reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

PROTECTING PISTOL-BRACED FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on January 13 of this year, the ATF finalized its unconstitutional rule pertaining to firearms with stabilizing braces. Under this new ATF rule, any pistol-braced firearm would be considered an illegal short-barreled rifle, subjecting these firearms to draconian regulations under the NFA, the National Firearms Act of 1934, and turning millions of law-abiding gun owners into criminals literally overnight.

Unselected antigun bureaucrats informed law-abiding gun owners possessing pistols with these braces attached that they will have only 120 days to register them once the rule is published in the Federal Register. This 120-day amnesty window started yesterday, January 31.

As we have seen across the world time and time again, what comes before gun confiscation? Gun registration. That is right. That is exactly what ATF is now demanding.

For stabilizer brace owners who do not wish to register their firearms, the ATF provides four alternatives.

The first: Turn in the entire firearm with the attached stabilizing brace to the ATF. That means forfeiting your firearm.

The second: Destroy the whole firearm. Again, another forfeiture of your firearm.

The third: Convert the pistol brace into a long-barreled rifle that does not require registration but is also much more difficult to use with a brace.

The fourth: Permanently remove and dispose of, or alter the stabilizing brace, from the firearm so that it cannot be reattached.

If gun owners who possess braced firearms refuse to register, destroy, turn in, or alter their firearm after this 120-day window, they face National Firearms Act violations, felony violations, including hefty fines of up to \$250,000 and up to 10 years in prison for having an unregistered short-barreled rifle.

In other words, the ATF's rule turns law-abiding gun owners into criminals, into felons, for simply doing nothing.

That is right. If they do nothing, then after 120 days, they are in felony violation of ATF's reinterpreted law, all for simply maintaining their Second Amendment freedoms.

What exactly are these alleged hazardous stabilizing braces? A pistol brace, also known as a stabilizing brace, is simply an accessory that is attached to the rear of a large firearm in order to anchor the gun to the shooter's arm to better stabilize it, allowing them to be more accurately shot one-handed, just like what you see right here. This is a stabilizing brace.

These braces were actually designed to help disabled veterans enjoy the sport of shooting. In fact, as a Federal firearms licensee, my company has sold many of these pistol brace firearms to assist disabled veterans so they can improve their shooting capabilities and their accuracy.

Unfortunately, these beneficial braces have faced uninformed and unwarranted backlash from unelected bureaucrats for years.

In 2012, the ATF provided a letter determining that pistol braces were legal to use and to shoulder. This decision was then reversed 3 years later by the ATF. In 2015, stabilizing braces became illegal to shoulder, turning braced firearms into unregistered short-barreled rifles. The braces remained legal if held at arm's length but illegal if brought back to the shoulder. How does that make any sense?

This flip-flopped again in 2017 when stabilizing braces were once more determined to be legal to shoulder by the ATF, as long as the original design of the brace remained unmodified.

Here we are in 2023 as braced pistols are vilified yet again, declared by the ATF to be unregistered short-barreled rifles requiring registration and their owners classified as felons if they simply do nothing.

Clearly, as in most cases of unconstitutional gun control, unelected bureaucrats who have little to no knowledge of firearms or respect for Second Amendment rights are steamrolling ahead with unlawful restrictions, which will impact, estimates say, anywhere from 3 million to up to 40 million firearms across the country.

Why? To advance the less dangerous dream of disarming our Nation and dismantling our Second Amendment rights. That is what gun control is all about.

The ultimate goal is an unarmed and subjugated America. I can assure gun owners across this great Nation that I and Second Amendment-loving Republican colleagues will do everything in our power to never allow that to happen.

We are fighting this, and we are not going to give up. Congress cannot allow the ATF to brazenly disregard both our Constitution and Congress' role, its sole role in legislation, its legislative authority.

I don't know if ATF Director Dettelbach needs a copy of the Constitution to revisit the explicit language of the Second Amendment or the direct powers granted to the three branches of government, but the last time I checked, only Congress has the authority to make laws.

Let me say that again. Congress makes laws, not unelected antigun bureaucrats at the ATF or any other part of the executive branch, for that matter.

Yet, given the ATF's severely misguided decision to advance its unconstitutional pistol brace rule, I am actively leading the fight to stop this grave injustice.

We have three key tools available to us in Congress to fight the ATF's tyranny.

The first is H.R. 646, the Stop Harassing Owners of Rifles Today Act, or the SHORT Act, which I reintroduced yesterday with Senators ROGER MARSHALL and JOHN KENNEDY. This legislation repeals elements of the National Firearms Act, thereby prohibiting the ATF from registering and banning pistols with stabilizing braces.

The second element is a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act, which we will introduce in a matter of days to block the ATF's rule from infringing on Americans' Second Amendment rights. Congressman RICHARD HUDSON, our NRCC chair, has joined me in co-leading this in the House, while Senators JOHN KENNEDY and ROGER MARSHALL will introduce the resolution in the Senate.

The third way that we can fight this here in Congress is through the power of the purse. As we write the ATF's appropriations for fiscal year 2024, we can prevent taxpayer dollars from funding this backdoor gun control through what is called a limitation amendment. As a new member on the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice,

Science, and Related Agencies, I look forward to assisting in this effort.

With these three initiatives, we can work together to stop the ATF's unconstitutional overreach.

It would be better if the ATF simply decided to rescind the pistol brace rule so we would not have to take these permanent measures, but we are fully prepared to do so if they will not rescind it.

I am proud to have several of my colleagues here tonight to expose the ATF's unconstitutional rule, as well as to highlight how Congress can stop this latest form of gun control from infringing on law-abiding gun owners' Second Amendment freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for doing this today, and I thank him for leading the fight.

Yesterday, I stood on this floor fighting to protect Americans' First Amendment rights. Today, I am standing here fighting to protect Americans' Second Amendment rights. God help our Constitution.

Congress has afforded far too much deference to unelected D.C. bureaucrats in Federal agencies, and it is time, with our majority, to rein in that extreme power.

The left has talked about taking your gas stoves away, has censored your speech, and now the ATF, under the guidance of this administration, is coming to take away millions of pistols from law-abiding gun owners, individuals who own pistol braces, which were originally approved by the ATF themselves.

What has changed? What is different? What is new? I will tell you what has changed. What has changed is now we have an administration that is desperate to erode our Second Amendment rights in more and more pervasive ways as every year passes. It has continually chipped away at Americans' constitutional rights because of the lack of understanding of what the actual roots of gun violence are.

The administration is abusing the powers delegated to the ATF to illegally track gun owners, perform unauthorized compliance checks at people's homes, and now banning popular modifications that, I will say it again, they approved in the first place.

It has to stop. We are tired of it. Americans are tired of it. This has to end. That is why I am proud to join these efforts to protect gun owners across this great United States of America.

As their duly elected Representatives, we must fight back. We must stand tall. We must be tough and stand against this abuse of power on their behalf.

Let me say this: As a duly elected official and a gun owner myself, all I have left to say to the ATF is enough is enough. Our right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Mr. CLYDE. I thank my good friend from New Jersey, from one of those blue States where you don't necessarily think that there are passionate gun owners. I appreciate them.

Mr. VAN DREW. South Jersey. I am going to teach you that. South Jersey is a lot different.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), who is also the co-chair of our Second Amendment Caucus here in Congress and my good friend.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank my friend, fellow Freedom Caucus colleague, and proven fighter for the Second Amendment, Mr. CLYDE, for organizing this Special Order. I thank him for highlighting what is going on here.

Mr. Speaker, the ATF's new pistol brace rule violates the separation of powers. Bureaucrats don't create laws; Congress does. This rule functions like a law that Congress never passed.

ATF—Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. In western Colorado, we call that a fun weekend, but D.C. bureaucrats have used this agency to infringe on the rights of the American people.

When you research how many pistol braces the ATF expects to be registered, the number varies. Some say 10 million, others say 20 million, and it may even be 40 million.

Why such disparity? Because the ATF doesn't know how many are out there because law-abiding Americans do not trust them enough to tell them.

In fact, there are probably going to be many more boating accidents this spring and summer than we have ever encountered in U.S. history from law-abiding gun owners.

We don't trust the ATF because of their overreaching actions, exactly like we are seeing with this rule.

There has been a lot of talk about defunding the ATF, even abolishing the agency altogether. I am still waiting to hear a good reason why the ATF should remain an agency at all. I have yet to hear one.

Instead of providing regulations that keep our communities safe, this agency has made our communities more dangerous by laundering weapons to the cartels. Operation Fast and Furious exposed the recklessness of the ATF, how little regard they have for the rule of law, and Americans have had a hard time viewing this agency and its rules as legitimate.

Think about it. The ATF had about 1,700 firearms that were being tracked. They had tracers on them. They were selling to known criminals during this Operation Fast and Furious. They lost 1,700 traced firearms, and now they expect to go after law-abiding American citizens for firearm accessories?

Are they really that competent to go after this many millions of Americans for a firearm accessory, a stabilizing brace, when they had 1,700 tracked firearms in the hands of known criminals that they just lost?

I think that alone proves the legitimacy of this agency, and I am very ex-

cited to bring them into an Oversight and Accountability Committee hearing so they can speak for themselves as to why they should remain an agency in our Federal Government and not have the appropriate features of their agency put under another, like the FBI, once we clean that out.

□ 1830

But other than that, the Second Amendment, it is absolute.

All the regulations the bureaucrats make, the laws that bureaucrats are trying to make, the unconstitutional laws that are passed by the Federal Government, the State legislatures, they make our country less safe. Gun-free zones are the most dangerous places in our country.

The Second Amendment is absolute, and it is here to stay.

A recent report states that Americans own 46 percent of the world's guns. I think we need to get our numbers up, boys and girls.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLYDE for hosting this Special Order. I thank him for bringing us all together on this topic and, hopefully, we can shed some light to the American people and let them know that we are fighting against this agency and their abuse of separation of powers.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for her unwavering defense of the Second Amendment of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this important issue because the unelected career bureaucrats are at it again. They are launching attacks on our constitutional rights, the constitutional rights of law-abiding gun owners.

This seems to be the sole purpose of the agency lately, attacking the Second Amendment. Now they want to ban pistol braces.

Americans who don't know what a pistol brace is might have some obvious questions after hearing about this ban. What is a pistol brace? Obviously, it makes guns more deadly, right? It makes guns shoot faster. It makes them want to be used only by people who want to murder other people.

Why else would the ATF want to ban it?

But the Americans who actually use pistol braces know the reality: There is zero logical reason to ban pistol braces. It is a device used by a lot of disabled veterans, a lot of people I know, to provide more stability when shooting a gun.

Tens of millions of Americans own this brace, but they would immediately become felons when this goes into effect. That is not even practical from a law enforcement perspective.

Now, you could argue, actually, that the pistol brace makes the gun safer; it makes it less likely to shoot things they are not aiming at.

But no, the impulsive leaders at ATF have once again failed to apply simple logic and reason to their decision-making and, instead, chose to apply the mindset of the authoritarian, gun-grabbing bureaucrats we all know that they are.

Congress cannot sit idly by. I recently re-introduced a bipartisan piece of legislation that would create an appeals process for small business owners hurt by these haphazard rulings. Right now, the only recourse that exists is for these gun shop owners and manufacturers to sue the Federal Government in court.

Now, for the average American, that is not exactly doable. It takes time and a lot of money and a lot of resources.

My bill would put the ATF in line with every other Federal regulatory agency's appeal process and ensure Americans can petition their government for the redress of grievances and get decisions handed down in a timely manner.

These taxpayer-funded, anti-gun activists at the ATF cannot continue to trample on our Second Amendment rights without a response from Congress.

We must never cease fighting against these shameless power grabs, and Republican must use our House majority to protect law-abiding gun owners.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for those inspiring words.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my good friend.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for organizing this time on the floor. I think it is so important.

We are talking about the brace ruling from the ATF. A brace is a firearm accessory for disabled individuals. But I am sure Biden went to his Attorney General and to the ATF and said, you know what, I hate guns. How can I take millions of them off the street, without regard for if they are legally owned? And how can I do it without going to Congress because I really don't want to do that.

Now, keep in mind, this is administrative law. Our Founders were against this type of thing because they knew that the laws shouldn't change with each administration.

When Democrats controlled both Chambers of Congress and the White House, they didn't pass this legislation.

This ATF rule says that gun owners have 120 days of amnesty to register or destroy their firearm if it has this firearm accessory. If you don't obey, you become a felon.

What this administrative rule does not do is it does not make people safer. This ruling turns millions of law-abiding gun owners into criminals. Tens of millions of pistol braces have been sold in the United States, with the permission of the ATF, the written permission of the ATF.

They are telling you to take this off, or transfer it, or register it like a machine gun, basically, the same paperwork.

If you want to turn it into a short-barreled rifle, guess what? Twenty-six percent of Americans live in a State where the ATF has left them with no option. They will create an illegal gun in their State if they comply with the ATF ruling in order to keep their gun.

How much compliance do we think there is going to be?

Well, there was a bump stock rule similar to this. There are about half a million bump stocks estimated in circulation; 526 have been returned to the government. So they have made half a million felons is what they have done.

Now, Mr. CLYDE has several bills to fix this. I can anticipate—or I believe Justice Scalia, if he were alive, I can tell you, I believe, based on a meeting that I had with him, which one he would prefer.

Several of us had breakfast with Scalia, and we said, oh, Obama is so bad, and we don't have the constitutional balance of government. Fix this for us, Supreme Court.

Scalia said, this is not my job to referee fights between you and the executive branch. By the way, you are the most powerful, powerful branch. You are Article I, and you can't—you have all the tools you need to stop what he is doing.

One of my colleagues said, well, impeachment is so hard. Scalia said, I am not talking about impeachment. You are funding everything you complain about.

So I believe that his favorite method here, and it is certainly my favorite method, would have been to defund this activity.

The ruling is unconstitutional. The Second Amendment is clear. Shall not be infringed means shall not be infringed.

I urge all Americans to call their Representatives and support ANDREW CLYDE's bill.

Mr. CLYDE. I thank my good friend from Kentucky because he is absolutely right. We have the power of the purse.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my good friend.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me and for his efforts in leading this fight.

Let's get something straight. I am a proud Texan, and let me tell you, Texans are not happy when the government comes after their Second Amendment right.

My District 14, on the Gulf Coast of Texas, has more concealed handgun licenses than any other congressional district in Texas, and I have to assume in the country, for that matter.

The Second Amendment is extremely clear: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." What is so hard to understand about that?

But, let's face it, folks. The far left's dangerous attack on the United States Constitution continues unabated, with yet another example right here with

the ATF's unconstitutional pistol brace rule, which bans millions of firearms with stabilizing braces.

The ATF ruling could turn as many as 40 million Americans into felons, and those 40 million Americans are sick and tired of faceless bureaucrats trying to destroy the Second Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said, where the people fear the government, there is tyranny. Where the government fears the people, there is liberty.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, fear the government that fears your guns.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for those great words. He is absolutely correct. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), my good friend.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

The ATF's new rule criminalizing pistol braces is a brazen and unlawful attempt to usurp congressional authority. This pistol brace rule will fail for the same reason the bump stock rule failed: The ATF does not have the authority to create Federal law. Nobody voted for the ATF, though I know a lot of people who would vote against them if they could.

This new rule will ban pistol braces on certain firearms, forcing users to jump through numerous hoops to comply with this new decree or risk becoming a felon.

Disabled veterans and others have used these braces for years to help them fire pistols, and the ATF has unilaterally decided that this is no longer acceptable. Now, otherwise law-abiding Americans will either have to destroy their newly illegal firearms, or figure out how to comply with an arbitrary and confusing regulatory scheme outlined in the National Firearms Act.

The ATF cannot be trusted to protect our rights to keep and bear arms. There is no timeline in which the ATF, under any administration, would become an ally. It needs to go. We need to abolish the ATF before they abolish our Second Amendment rights.

Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms should be the name of a chain of convenience stores in Florida, not a Federal agency.

I urge every red-blooded American and every conservative in this Congress to stand with Representative CLYDE on his legislation, and to stand with me and cosponsor my bill, the Abolish the ATF Act of 2023. Let's get rid of this unlawful agency once and for all, and let this Special Order be considered a shot across the bow.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for that is, indeed, a great statement: A shot across the bow; a great example of what the United States Navy would do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), my good friend.

Mr. BURCHETT. I thank Mr. CLYDE and the Speaker for your service to our great country.

I don't have any notes for this, but I do want to say the ATF, to me, is the swamp.

Now, here we have a group of unelected bureaucrats, dadgummit, that have taken upon themselves to interpret a law.

It always reminds me, when I was in Nashville one time. I was sitting at the Crown Plaza across the street from the Capitol with one of my dear friends who just passed away; his name was Tom Hensley. He was called the Golden Goose. He was the liquor lobbyist. I never voted for his bills, but he always liked me.

He told me one time, a guy came up and threatened him that worked for our Governor and threatened him; and he sat there, and he chomped on his cigar; and he walked away and he said—BURCHETT, he said, you know what? He said, in a few more years he will be gone and the old goose will still be sitting here. That is exactly, exactly the mentality of the swamp.

It is not like on an episode of *The Simpsons* where they are all—six people are sitting around at a table in the old cartoon, and they are deciding what is going on. It is a bunch of unelected, arrogant bureaucrats who think they know what is best for this country.

Dadgummit, the ATF has overstepped their bounds once again. Law-abiding Americans, law-abiding citizens, law-abiding Tennesseans should not be deemed criminal because of some bureaucratic whim.

I appreciate the gentleman, thank him for his service to our country, thank him for this bill. I look forward to voting with him on this bill and being a sponsor.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for hosting this Special Order on an important topic.

My speech is well beyond the time I am allotted, so I am just going to dispense with the notes, really, and talk about how absolutely insane, ridiculous, and unconstitutional this new rule is.

Not only has it been completely blown out of proportion what the brace is, a brace that was originally designed for disabled veterans, increases stability, and since 2015, had been ruled as an accessory by the ATF which, under their own regulations, under their own guidance, they said that they didn't have jurisdiction over accessories.

So I thought that was very interesting that now we have an unelected swamp creature, a bureaucrat who thinks that they can now make felons—law-abiding citizens, felons by now instituting this 120-day rule.

A lot of people have talked about this, but few have talked about the

economic impact this will have. Based on the NICS data that we have, this is going to be a \$1.9 billion hit to the firearms industry; \$1.9 billion to law-abiding citizens.

Believe me, this rule has nothing to do with gun safety. This has nothing to do with making communities safer. This is just a backroom attempt, a backdoor attempt to get at the firearm industry. That is all this is and nothing more.

□ 1845

This is why, Mr. Speaker, we have to pass the SHORT Act. This is why we have to pass the REINS Act, because the REINS Act would prohibit any regulation that has a \$100 million or more impact to an industry to come back to Congress for an up or down vote.

You can fire your Congress-critter, but you cannot fire these unelected bureaucrats. We need to pass the REINS Act. We need to absolutely stop this regulation in its tracks. It is time to, once and for all, let those swamp creatures know that the Second Amendment shall not be infringed.

Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentleman from Georgia and my friend, Mr. CLYDE, for hosting this special order on such an important topic. Most of you have likely heard about the new rule from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, that targets stabilizing braces for pistols. The rule wrongly reclassifies these braces as "short rifles," which are heavily regulated under that National Firearms Act. The final rule, published yesterday, January 31st started a 120-day clock for law-abiding gunowners to destroy, forfeit, or register their braces with the ATF. Otherwise, the new regulation will consider any unregistered stabilizing pistol brace as a short-barreled rifle and will subject the owner to penalties of up to 10 years of imprisonment, up to a \$10,000 fine, or both.

This is insane and it's an infringement on Americans' Second Amendment rights through bureaucratic rulemaking.

For those who aren't familiar with stabilizing braces, these devices were originally designed with disabled veterans in mind and have been on the market for over a decade. Until last year, the ATF repeatedly stated that stabilizing braces did not convert the handguns into short-barreled rifles. In fact, they claimed going back to 2015 that braces were an accessory and therefore not subject to jurisdiction of the ATF. But Now, bureaucrats at the ATF are changing course. By changing this definition, the ATF is effectively making criminals out of millions of law-abiding Americans when they do not register by a certain date. The ATF is reversing over a decade of agency guidance and rulings on which the firearm industry and law-abiding gun owners have relied for years. The ATF estimates around three million stabilizing braces have been sold, however, a report from the Congressional Research Service puts that number much higher—between 10 million and 40 million.

If you look at just the cost—the cost of this new regulation—a rule put in place by unelected bureaucrats, this one rule will cost the firearm industry and gun owners a whopping \$1.9 billion! This number was calculated by using data in NICS and industry data on

the average cost of pistol braced firearms. Make no mistake. This new rule is not about gun safety. This is not about gun violence. This is a back door attempt to take down the firearm industry and make millions of law abiding citizens—felons. We must stop this unconstitutional overreach by the ATF and we will.

The Second Amendment is straightforward—the right to bears arms shall not be infringed. We cannot allow the federal government to make it harder—or impossible—for small business owners, homeowners, and law-abiding citizens to defend themselves. That is why we must pass the Joint Resolution of Disapproval for this rule, which prevents it from going into effect and prohibits the ATF from implementing a similar rule in the future. In addition, we must pass the SHORT Act, which would remove the unconstitutional taxation, registration, and regulation in the National Firearms Act of Short Barreled Rifles, Short Barreled Shotguns, and those classified as Any Other Weapons.

Finally, this is just another in a very long line of examples of why we must pass the REINS Act. The REINS Act would prohibit these swamp creatures—the unelected bureaucratic class from legislating from the agency rather than through Congress. The bill is simple. Any major rule or regulation would be required to come back to Congress for an up or down vote. Why? Because you can fire Your Congress-critter. But the big, government establishment has made it virtually impossible to fire these bureaucrats. Once passed, this rule would have never been allowed to go into effect. It's time to pass the Reins act. Time to pass the short act and protect our constitutional rights.

I am proud to join Representative CLYDE in introducing these bills, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the issue here tonight.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great colleague from the State of Florida for those encouraging remarks. I thank all of my colleagues who participated here in this Special Order tonight. It is incredibly important that we show Americans that we are united and unwavering in protecting and preserving our Second Amendment freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today after 3 p.m. on account of a family religious obligation that required his presence in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today after noon on account of official business related to the necessity of being unavoidably away in Memphis, Tennessee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-303. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Special Financial Assistance by PBGC-Withdrawal Liability Condition Exception (RIN: 1212-AB53) received January 30, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-304. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Dishwashers [EERE-2016-BT-TP-0012] (RIN: 1904-AD96) received January 27, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-305. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institutes of Health Loan Repayment Programs [Docket Number: NIH-2020-0001] (RIN: 0925-AA68) received January 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-306. A letter from the Director, RPMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Radiological Health Regulations; Amendments to Records and Reports for Radiation Emitting Electronic Products; Amendments to Performance Standards for Diagnostic X-ray, Laser, and Ultrasonic Products [Docket No.: FDA-2018-N-3303] (RIN: 0910-AH65) received January 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-307. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Calcium Carbonate; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2017-C-6238] received January 27, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-308. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Second 10-Year Maintenance Plan for the Indian Wells Valley PM10 Planning Area; California [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0549; FRL-8856-02-R9] received January 4, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-309. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (21-1.5e); Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0588; FRL-8582-03-OCSP] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-310. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval;

Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky Area to Attainment of the 2015 Ozone Standard; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0949; FRL-9532-03-R5] received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-311. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rimsulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0447; FRL-10478-01-OCSPP] received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-312. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Malic Acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0305; FRL-10494-01-OCSPP] received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-313. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Internal Network Security Monitoring for High and Medium Impact Bulk Electric System Cyber Systems [Docket No.: RM22-3-000; Order No.: 887] received January 26, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-314. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Procedures for Responding to Petitions for Rulemaking received January 4, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-315. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's enforcement policy statement — Policy Statement on Enforcement Related to Gig Work received January 4, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-316. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: DOD-2016-OS-0045] (RIN: 0790-AL58) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-317. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's policy statement — Statement of the Commission on Use of Prior Approval Provisions in Merger Orders received January 4, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-318. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Initial Guidance Regarding the Application of the Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax under Sections 55, 56A, and 59 of the Internal Revenue Code [Notice 2023-7] received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-319. A letter from the Branch Chief, Legal Processing Division, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Prevailing Wage and Apprenticeship Initial Guidance Under Section 45(b)(6)(B)(ii) and Other Substantially Similar Provisions [Notice 2022-61] received January 24, 2023,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-320. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Treatment of Special Enforcement Matters [TD 9969] (RIN: 1545-BP01) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-321. A letter from the Branch Chief, Legal Processing Division, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Information Reporting of Health Insurance Coverage and Other Issues Under Sections 5000A, 6055, and 6056 [TD 9970] (RIN: 1545-BQ11) received January 24, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-322. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — TCJA Section 174 Changes in Method of Accounting (Rev. Proc. 2023-8) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-323. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Changes in accounting period and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2023-11) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-324. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting the Office's Annual Report on Awards and Settlements for Calendar Year 2022 for Employing Offices of the House of Representatives, the Report on Awards and Settlements for Calendar Year 2022 for Employing Offices of the Senate, and the Report on Awards and Settlements for Calendar year 2022 for Employing Offices other than Employing Offices of the House of Representatives or the Senate, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1381(1)(1)(A); Public Law 104-1, title III, 301(1)(1)(A) (as added by Public Law 115-397, title II, 201(a)(1)(B)); (132 Stat. 5315); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RESCENTHALER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 8. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House (Rept. 118-2). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON,

Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LIEU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act to expand employees eligible for leave and employers subject to leave requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the use of certain taxes and revenues; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mrs. TORRES of California):

H.R. 696. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Eastvale, California; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to clarify that disparate impacts on certain populations constitute a sufficient basis for rights of action under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO,

Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGERDOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 698. A bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to authorize a study to review specific outcomes of entrepreneurial skills development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 700. A bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for

purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 701. A bill to restrict the appointment of certain military personnel to diversity, equity, and inclusion positions; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 702. A bill to protect consumers from price-gouging of residential rental and sale prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BROWN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. IVEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER):

H.R. 703. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs that include the history of peoples of African descent in the settling and founding of America, the economic and political environments that led to the development, institutionalization, and abolition of slavery and its impact on all Americans, the exploration and expansion of America, impact on and contributions to the development and enhancement of American life, United States history, literature, the economy, politics, body of laws, and culture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 704. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. MACE, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SELF, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CLINE, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BABIN,

Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. HOUGHIN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. CARL, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 705. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from transmitting certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWN (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 706. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to allow households with children with chronic medical conditions to deduct allowable medical expenses incurred by such household member that exceeds \$35 per month; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 707. A bill to require a study of the barriers to conservation practice adoption on leased agricultural land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 708. A bill to require the Natural Resources Conservation Service to review the national conservation practice standards, taking into consideration climate benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MRVAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 709. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Muhammad Ali, in recognition of his contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 710. A bill to establish a national commission on fiscal responsibility and reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 711. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the short-term limited duration insurance exemption with respect to individual health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ROY, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 712. A bill to reimburse the States for border security expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 713. A bill to provide enhanced capabilities to combat transnational criminal cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ (for herself, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 714. A bill to amend the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 to extend the feral swine eradication and control pilot program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAMLAGERDOVE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASE, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. TRONE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. NICKEL, Ms. ROSS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILD, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CHU, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE,

Mr. IVEY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. BROWN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. BALINT, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CROW, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 715. A bill to require a background check for every firearm sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROSS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CROW, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 716. A bill to provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Accountability, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 717. A bill to prohibit the removal from the United States of certain veterans, to expedite their naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 718. A bill to amend the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to include certain services in the definition of critical services for purposes of repair, restoration, and replacement of damaged facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 719. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act to prohibit neutrality agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 720. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 722. A bill to decrease dependency on People's Republic of China manufacturing and decrease migration due to lost regional economic opportunities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 723. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require States to include a photograph on electronic benefit cards issued to provide supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 724. A bill to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 725. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make grants to certain border communities for the purpose of reimbursing such communities for expenses related to security measures along the United States land border with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN (for herself, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. MACE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 726. A bill to amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to implement fertility controls to manage populations of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and to encourage training opportunities for military veterans to assist in range management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON, Mr.

COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. BUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. IVEY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. STEVENS, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 727. A bill to establish a National Council on African American History and Culture within the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 728. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training to carry out a pilot program on short-term fellowship programs for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 729. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to remove the Emancipation Memorial from Lincoln Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 730. A bill to amend section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to require an electronic, searchable database of the importation, production, shipment, receipt, sale, or other disposition of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 731. A bill to prohibit certain noncompetitive agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. PORTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DELUZIO, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 732. A bill to rename the program under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. SABLON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CASTEN):

H.R. 733. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve mental health

care for veterans through the establishment of a minimum requirement for the number of Vet Centers per State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. FOX, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CARL):

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of such Act in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 735. A bill to increase the benefits guaranteed in connection with certain pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 736. A bill to require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SABLON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 737. A bill to establish the Ralph David Abernathy, Sr. National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all direct and indirect subsidies that benefit the production or export of sugar by all major sugar-producing and -consuming countries should be eliminated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H. Res. 84. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BERA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WIL-

LIAMS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H. Res. 85. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations Security Council should immediately impose an arms embargo against the military of Burma; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BERA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H. Res. 86. A resolution condemning the Burmese military for perpetrating gross violations of human rights as part of its brutal campaign to suppress the democratic aspirations of the people of Burma, two years after the coup d'etat on February 1, 2021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 87. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. MANNING, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. NICKEL, and Ms. ROSS):

H. Res. 88. A resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in during Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CLOUD, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. OGLES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CLYDE, Ms. MACE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FALLON, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, and Mr. HERN):

H. Res. 89. A resolution impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FALLON, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. SELF, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H. Res. 90. A resolution demanding that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China immediately release Mark Swidan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H. Res. 91. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 1, 2023, as

"George Washington Carver Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 738. A bill for the relief of Mykhaylo Gnatyuk and Melnik Gnatyuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 739. A bill for the relief of Tetyana Zvarychuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 740. A bill for the relief of Igor Klyuchenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Family and Medical Leave

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X to the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Aviation.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this Legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would establish a single, unique ZIP code for Eastvale California

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this bill is:

Civil Rights

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legislation to prohibit the sale, transfer, manufacture, and importation of semiautomatic weapons.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

a tax relief measure.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

Restricts the appointment of certain military personnel to diversity, equity, and inclusion positions.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medicare

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states "[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

The single subject of this legislation is:

Second Amendment related due process rights for VA beneficiaries with fiduciaries.

By Ms. BROWN:

H.R. 706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

To improve child nutrition.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

agricultural conservation

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Agricultural conservation

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This Muhammad Ali Congressional Gold Medal act will award Muhammad Ali with the Congressional Gold Medal

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishing a National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform charged with producing recommendations, subject to expedited legislative procedures, to stabilize the nation's fiscal outlook.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare" of Americans.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Eliminate Junk Plans

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reimburse states for funds spent carrying out federal responsibilities.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide federal government with enhanced tools to go after transnational criminal cartels that illegally smuggle drugs and people into the United States.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Feral swine

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Background Checks

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly.

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States;

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amendment to the definition of critical services eligible for specified recovery funding.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Allowing employers to contract with employees and labor unions as they see fit.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Repealing the Davis-Bacon law requiring the federal government to pay the "prevailing wage."

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Providing whistleblower protections for union workers.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To nearshore manufacturing in the Western Hemisphere to reduce dependency on the People's Republic of China and to decrease illegal immigration.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Welfare

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas:

H.R. 725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Border Security

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H.R. 726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to implement fertility controls to manage populations of wild free-roaming horses and burros.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is: Humanities

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, Congress has the power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United State."

The single subject of this legislation is:

The "Veterans Fellowship Act" directs the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans Employment and Training to carry out a pilot program to allow states to use grants or contracts to carry out a short-term fellowship program for veterans. The pilot program would allow veterans to participate as fellows with an employer for a maximum of 20 weeks, receive a monthly stipend, and have the opportunity for long-term employment.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

to require the Secretary of the Interior to remove the Emancipation Memorial in Lincoln Park in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Law enforcement and crime prevention.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Economy

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medicare

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 16 of section 8 of article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation will be intended to bring additional mental health care for veterans through expanding access to Vet Center readjustment counseling locations.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Expanding protections for women in sports under Title IX.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To increase the benefits guaranteed in connection with certain pension plans

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishing an unit of the National Park System to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations through legislation.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration: Private Bill

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration: Private Bill

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration: Private Bill

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 140: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 163: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 171: Mr. FINSTAD.

H.R. 208: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 234: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 239: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 253: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 263: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 294: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. BROWN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. OMAR, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 344: Mr. BRECHEN.
 H.R. 353: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
 H.R. 354: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 396: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. STEVENS.
 H.R. 406: Ms. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 421: Mr. HUNT.
 H.R. 432: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 451: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EDWARDS, and Ms. HAGEMAN.
 H.R. 475: Mr. ALLRED, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 488: Mr. MANN.
 H.R. 494: Mr. STEUBE and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
 H.R. 508: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
 H.R. 525: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 562: Mr. SELF.
 H.R. 563: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 566: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
 H.R. 603: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 613: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. THANEDAR.
 H.R. 644: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
 H.R. 645: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 648: Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 659: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 660: Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of

Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr.

SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CASAR.

H.R. 670: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 676: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 683: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

H.J. Res. 7: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. STRONG, Mr. CISCOMANI, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.J. Res. 18: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. DELUZIO.

H. Res. 33: Ms. SHERRILL.

H. Res. 39: Mr. BABIN, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. VAN DUYNE.

H. Res. 72: Mrs. KIM of California.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 29: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.